FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

26 October 1983

Vol III No 208

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Commentary on Missile Preparations in GDR, CSSR AA 1
'Enforced Measure' AA 1
[Bogachev]
Andropov 'Warning' Cited AA 2
[Levchenko]
Countermeasures 'Completely Justified' AA 3
[Vasilyev]
Foreign Press Summarized AA 4
West's INF Arguments Deemed 'Wanton Lies' AA 4
[Kraminov in PRAVDA 24 Oct]
'Responsible' Soviet Disarmament Proposals Itemized AA 8
[Beglov in IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]
Arbatov Interviewed on INF, Detente, KAL, China AA 10
[Hamburg DER SPIEGEL 24 Oct]
Correction to PRAVDA Editorial Article on START AA 22

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

TASS Reports Statement by Socialist Peace Groups BB 1
Prague Session of Intercosmos Nations Ends BB 1
[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

UN Officials Express Views on Events in Grenada CC 1
UN Security Council Begins Discussion of Grenada CC 1
WPC Condemns U.S. 'Aggression' Against Grenada CC 1
UN Committee Discusses Nonuse of Force CC 2
Helsinki Hosts Preparations for CSCE Talks CC 3
AUCCTU Secretary Addresses Sofia Meeting CC 3
U.S. Technology Exchange Restrictions Criticized CC 4
[TRUD 15 Oct]
Briefs: International Investment Bank Meeting; Baltic Sea Seminar CC 7

UNITED STATES & CANADA

U.S. Congressmen Criticize Reagan Over Lebanon A 1
U.S. Army 'Saboteurs' Units Stepping Up Training A 2
[Arzumanov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Oct]
Moscow: U.S. Space Weapons To Cover First Strike A 3
U.S. Foreign Policy Since Dimitrov Trial Assessed A 4
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Oct]

NORTHEAST ASIA

IZVESTIYA Calls for End to DPRK 'Slander Campaign' C 1
[Ganshin, 24 Oct]

EASTERN EUROPE

Fojtik-led CPCZ Delegation Visits Moscow F 1
[PRAVDA 24 Oct]

WESTERN EUROPE

Resistance in FRG to 'U.S. Sinister Plans' G 1
French RDF Designed for Anti-Soviet Operations G 2
British Weekly Cited on Expansion of U.S. Bases G 2
Ryzhov Meets Italian Foreign Ministry Official G 3
USSR's Vienna Envoy Receives Peace Marchers G 3
[Vienna ARBEITER ZEITUNG 25 Oct]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

U.S. Policy on Lebanon, Statements Scored H 1
U.S. To Continue 'Occupation' H 1
[Demchenko in PRAVDA 25 Oct]
'Absurd Anti-Soviet Lie' H 2
[Kudelin]
Comparison With Vietnam H 2
[Lapin]
U.S. 'Interference' Blamed H 3
[Kozyakov]
Syria Denies Involvement in Beirut Blasts H 4
Ministers of Multinational Force Countries To Meet H 4
Ryabov, Delegation Return From Tunisia H 5
Moscow Highlights Cooperation With Libya H 5
PDRY Leader Responds to Andropov Message H 5
[PRAVDA 23 Oct]
New Soviet Ambassador to Sudan Named H 6
[PRAVDA 21 Oct]
Egypt Remains 'Prisoner of Camp David' H 6
[Kapralov in IZVESTIYA 18 Oct]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Soviet Union Condemns U.S. Invasion of Grenada K 1
Preparations for Invasion of Grenada Observed K 2
U.S.-Led 'Intervention' in Grenada Reported K 3
Caribbean Community Role Noted K 3
'Independence' Leads Warships K 4
Airports Seized K 4
Cubans Killed, Wounded K 4
Caribbean Collusion 'Coverup' K 5
U.S. Losses 'Admitted' K 5
Reagan Assertions Assailed K 6
Landing Planned Last Week K 6
'Incursion' Details K 7
'Selfless' Cubans in Battle K 7
Cuban Ammunition Shortage K 8
'Revolutionary Morale' High K 8
[Yegorov]
U.S. Grenada Attack 'Same Old Gunboat Diplomacy' K 8
[Chigir]
Arbatov: U.S. Wants 'Small, Glorious War' K 9
[London PRESS ASSOCIATION]

Grenada 'Victim' of U.S. 'Imperial Policy' K 10
Anglo-American 'Ambitions' in Caribbean Assailed K 11
[Gan]
Grenada Offensive 'Serious Threat' to Nicaragua K 11
[Dunayev]
IZVESTIYA on U.S. Central, South America Policy K 12
[Falin, 19 Oct]
Nicaragua Calls for Troop Withdrawal From Grenada K 14
Chernenko, Ponomarev Meet Mexican Party Delegates K 14
Guatemalan Rebels Hit U.S. 'Intervention' Policy K 15
Chernenko, Ponomarev Meet Mexican Party Delegates K 15
Mexican Delegate Holds Moscow Press Conference K 16

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Kuznetsov Attends Plan, Budget Session R 1
Demichev Addresses Academy of Arts Session R 1
Armenian TU Chairman To Chair Department R 2
[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 6 Oct]
PRAVDA Discusses Work With Leader Cadres R 2
[Editorial, 18 Oct]
TASS Updates Operation To Rescue Ice-Bound Ships R 4

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA Carries 9-Month Industry Figures S 1
[23 Oct]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

CSA Data on Progress of RSFSR Autumn Field Work T 1
USSR Livestock-Raising Figures for Jan-Sep 1983 T 1
[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 43]
Moscow Area Potato, Vegetable Sales Exceed Plan T 3
[PRAVDA 24 Oct]

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Obituary of Military Consultant Bednyagin V 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Oct]
KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL Editor's Obituary V 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Oct]

COMMENTARY ON MISSILE PREPARATIONS IN GDR, CSSR

'Enforced Measure'

LD251922 Moscow TASS in English 1835 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS -- TASS news analyst on military affairs Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Washington official propagandists are now falling over themselves to convince the West European public that the adoption by the Soviet Union of measures in reply to the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Western Europe will in no way affect the FRG, Britain, Italy and other NATO countries that have supported the United States nuclear plans.

Meanwhile, it is naturally not all the same to European NATO countries what missiles, in what numbers and what distance from their territory will be deployed.

The U.S. "Pershings" and cruise missiles, if they are deployed in Western Europe, will really increase the threat to the Soviet Union and its allies. But these U.S. nuclear systems will in no measure strengthen the security of Western Europe. Quite the contrary, irreversible retaliatory measures of the Soviet Union, deployment of new missiles which will take 4-5 minutes to reach targets in the FRG and Britain will place European NATO countries in a position similar to the position of the USSR and other socialist countries.

In that case leaders of European NATO countries will have to experience what it is like to wait for Washington's further military ventures of a "limited", "protracted", or "demonstrative" nature while sitting on a powder keg they placed on their land themselves.

Who will gain from such developments? Naturally, not peoples of Western Europe.

The decision of socialist countries to start preparation for the deployment of Soviet missile complexes of the operational-tactical designation on the territories of the GDR and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is an enforced measure, but the measure that is absolutely necessary for the ensurance of the security of the Soviet Union and its allies in the Warsaw Treaty. Socialist countries take this step only in answer to actions of the United States which is now concluding the preparation for the deployment of new medium-range missiles in Western Europe.

The Warsaw Treaty countries declared and declare for the maintenance of a military balance in Europe at a level much lower and less dangerous than now.

Precisely this cardinal provision is the basis for the Soviet proposals for cutting to one-third the present medium-range nuclear delivery vehicles on the continent to the absolute equality of the sides for the number of missiles, aircraft and nuclear charges.

The Soviet Union proceeds from the view that the achievement by NATO countries of military superiority as a result of the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe would be a variant of the development of the military-political situation in the continent the most dangerous for the cause of peace.

The military balance in Europe, the parity of nuclear forces of NATO and the USSR is an earnest of peace on the European Continent and under no circumstances will the socialist community allow the United States to disrupt it.

Andropov 'Warning' Cited

LD252359 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] In line with the agreement of the governments of the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, and Czechoslovakia, preparatory work is beginning on the territories of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia for the deployment of tactical missiles. Leonid Levchenko makes these comments:

This agreement is one of the countermeasures planned in case American nuclear missiles are stationed in Europe. The steps are taken because the United States is completing preparations for deploying ballistic Pershing II missiles and land-based cruise missiles of a great range of action in a number of West European NATO countries/ The Soviet Union and its allies in the Warsaw Treaty Organization have drawn the attention of the United States and its NATO partners and other countries many times to the dangerous consequences of the possible deployment of new American first-strike nuclear missiles in Europe.

At the same time they express confidence that an agreement on reducing nuclear armaments in Europe would meet the interests of peace in Europe and the rest of the world, an agreement based on the principles of true equality and equal security of the sides.

The Soviet Union defends this viewpoint at the Geneva tlaks with the United States and confirms it by concrete proposals. Thus, the Soviet Union has proposed to rid Europe in general of all nuclear weapons, tactical as well as intermediate-range. The United States and other NATO countries rejected this proposal. Our readiness for such a radical solution remains invariable. The Soviet Union aiso put forward another far-reaching version, to renounce the stationing of any new medium-range weapons in Europe and cut down the existing armaments of the type by approximately two-thirds and leave 300 units of such weapons on the side of the Soviet Union and NATO in the meantime. It took into account the fact that three NATO countries, the United States, Britain and France, have nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles, while on the side of the Warsaw Treaty only the Soviet Union has them. In case the Soviet proposal is realized, both sides would keep an equal number of delivery vehicles, that is missiles and aircraft, and an equal number of nuclear charges. The Soviet Union is ready to destroy the Soviet missiles, including SS-20's,subject to a reduction under such an understanding. This would be a fair understanding which would take into account the balance of forces on the continent and provide for equal security of Warsaw Treaty countries and NATO. Working for the deployment of its first-strike nuclear missiles in Europe, the United States is trying to shift the existing parity in its own favor and make its NATO allies hostages of the policy to guarantee the United States world domination.

The Soviet Union and other member-nations of the Warsaw Treaty Organization are convinced that there is a possibility to agree on the most complicated problems even in the present situation. But the readiness of the Soviet Union for agreement is not a manifestation of weakness. The statement of the Soviet leader, Yuriy Andropov, of 28 September defined this quite clearly. It contained the warning that in case American missiles are stationed in Europe, the Soviet Union will have to take steps to guarantee the security of its allies in the Warsaw Treaty Organization as well as its own security.

Countermeasures 'Completely Justified'

LD260433 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Viktor Vasilyev Commentary]

[Text] Next, comments by Viktor Vasilyev about the decision to begin planning the deployment of Soviet tactical missiles in the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia under agreements with the governments of these countries.

The Soviet leadership has often warned that if the American Pershing II and cruise missiles are sited in Europe it will pose an additional threat to the security of the Soviet Union and its allies. Under these circumstances the Soviet Union will have to take appropriate countermeasures to maintain the balance of forces on a regional, European, and global scale. This was also clearly stated by the leaders of the seven countries in the Warsaw Treaty Organization after a meeting in Moscow in June. They said that the socialist countries will not under any circumstances allow military superiority over them. Preparations being completed now to site American ballistic Pershing II and cruise missiles in a number of West European NATO countries will create an additional threat to the Soviet Union and its allies in the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The threat is primarily because these weapons will upset the balance of medium range missiles in Europe and give a military advantage to the United States and NATO in general.

Whether Washington likes or wants to admit it or not there is approximately parity of nuclear forces in Europe. The Soviet Union does not have monopoly on medium-range nuclear weapons. The United States, Britain and France, which belong to the NATO bloc, have these weapons. There are British and French missiles with a range of 3,000 to 4,5000 km and carrying from three to even six warheads. And there are American medium-range bombers and carrier-borne attack planes specially equipped with nuclear weapons, as well as French Mirage IV aircraft. The Soviet Union has more missiles and NATO has more nuclear capacity aircraft. What is more, in terms of warheads the correlation is one to one point four in favor of NATO. And it is an important point that American planes are capable of reaching many cities in the European part of the Soviet Union while Soviet medium-range missiles, not to mention medium-range bombers, cannot reach the United States. To ignore the actual balance of forces is to strive for unilateral military advantages, not a fair agreement.

Apparently, this is what the Reagan administration is after. It is rejecting all the Soviet Union's constructive proposals to keep any more missiles from being deployed in Europe and to considerably reduce medium-range nuclear missiles already there. The Soviet Union proposes reducing nuclear delivery aircraft in the USSR and the NATO countries by three times. The Soviet Union would not have one warhead or bomb more than NATO. That proposal is based on the actual opposition of the two military political alliances on the principles of equality and equal security.

At the same time, Washington continues to put forth proposals that are unacceptable to the Soviet Union and the other countries in the Warsaw Treaty Organization. They are unacceptable because their goal is to upset parity by siting right next to the socialist countries new American nuclear missiles intended as first-strike weapons. And the recent initiatives made by President Reagan do not offer any basic changes. He has offered to count in the overall balance of medium-range nuclear forces nuclear-capacity aircraft and to change NATO's ratio of Pershing II and cruise missiles. The offer is basically no different because Washington wants to deploy new American missiles in addition to the British and French missiles and the entire nuclear arsenal that NATO already has in Europe.

The position of the United States Administration at the Geneva talks was planned to made the talks fail so that the new missiles in Europe can be justified. This is fraught with the most serious consequences not only to Europe but to the entire world. It will not strengthen the security of the European nations but will only further weaken it. The Soviet Union cannot be indifferent to NATO's nuclear buildup in Europe. It must protect its security and that is why the USSR and its allies in the Warsaw Treaty Organization are responding to the final preparations to deploy new American nuclear missiles in Federal Germany, Britain and Italy with beginning preparations to site their own missiles. The Soviet Union has stated quite clearly that if the American nuclear missiles are placed in Europe it will respond with countermeasures that would affect the territory of countries where the missiles will be sited, as well as the territory of the United States. Such reciprocal measures are completely justified and fair. They are justified both from a military and from a political point of view, and they are fair from a highest moral point of view.

Foreign Press Summarized

LD251514 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] The foreign press reports additional measures the Soviet Union is obliged to take to ensure its own security and that of its Warsaw Treaty allies in connection with preparations being completed by the United States to deploy Pershing II and long-range cruise missiles in a number of West European NATO countries. The papers draw attention to the fact that on the territory of the GDR and the CSSR, by agreement with the governments of the USSR, the GDR and the CSSR, preparatory work is starting for the deployment of missile complexes of operational-tactical designation. Press organs appraise this action as a planned response in the event of deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe. These measures are designed to maintain the balance of nuclear means between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO in Europe. The Soviet Union, the British MORNING STAR writes, has repeatedly and absolutely clearly made it understood that if the West embarks on the deployment of Pershings and cruise missiles, then appropriate countermeasures will be taken. Even at the present stage, the paper stresses, the USSR has taken initiatives which could reverse the arms race. The Soviet side has specifically announced, the Japanese TOKYO SHIMBUN writes, that in the event of deployment of new U.S. nuclear missile means in West Europe, it will take responsive measures and in no event will it permit the nuclear superiority of the United States.

WEST'S INF ARGUMENTS DEEMED 'WANTON LIES'

PM251052 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 83 First Edition p 6

[D. Kraminov article: "A Decisive Fall: The Peoples Against Nuclear Madness"]

[Text] The struggle whose outcome will determine whether Europe takes a dangerous step toward the abyss of nuclear catastrophe or remove itself a safe distance from it is entering its decisive state.

Those people for whom the fate of the cradle of our civilization is precious are bending their efforts toward preventing the European Continent from being turned into a field for what the American President calls a "limited" nuclear war, which could leave a dead radiactive desert in its wake.

The enemies of Europe, of whom there are many among transatlantic industrial and financial bosses, as well as among politicians and generals, regard its western part as their own military bridgehead and as an arena of the cold war contributing to increased preparations for a "hot" nuclear war.

Therefore the extremely reactionary, aggressively militarist circles of the United States and its NATO accomplices are seeking to turn a number of West European countries, and above all the FRG, into a launchpad for American first-strike nuclear missiles targeted on the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. If this happens, the life and death of the European Continent will depend even more on Washington's whim.

The opposing forces' points of departure are well known. Expressing the hopes and aspirations of all the European peoples, the socialist portion of the continent has in recent years put forward for discussion and examination a comprehensive program for lowering the level of military, and above all nuclear, confrontation in Europe. The program which has just been ratified at the latest session of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee in Sofia envisages both crucial large-scale measures and partial limited moves within defined limits.

Under this program the use of force, as well as the threat of using it, would be removed from relations between states, and all disagreements would be resolved only by peaceful means and through negotiations. The armed forces concentrated in central Europe by both sides would be significantly reduced and brought to equivalent levels, and the burden of military expenditure would be substantially eased for everyone.

The USSR and its allies resolutely and tirelessly seek to obtain the complete removal of the danger of nuclear war, or at least during the initial period, a significant reduction in that danger. The Soviet Union has unilaterally taken a step of exceptional importance -- it has pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. And if other nuclear powers were to follow our example, the likelihood of a nuclear war breaking out would be virtually reduced to zero. The Soviet Government has supported the idea of creating zones free from nuclear weapons. Our appeal to resolve jointly the question of banning and destroying nuclear weapons has been made to the nuclear powers.

The socialist part of Europe is making particular efforts to remove or at least sharply reduce the nuclear threat of our continent, where enormous stocks of these weapons, both medium-range and tactical, have already been accumulated. The Soviet Union has proposed destroying all its nuclear systems of given categories. But the NATO governments, which are shedding crocodile tears over the "weakness" of their weapons and are whipping up fears concerning "Soviet superiority," have not wished even to discuss this proposal.

Nevertheless, seeking a significant reduction in nuclear confrontation on the continent, the USSR has proposed renouncing the deployment on European soil of any kind of new medium-range systems and reducing by approximately two-thirds the existing systems, leaving each side -- NATO and the USSR -- with 300 units each. This proposal, equalizing the medium-range nuclear armaments of East and West, was also rejected without serious argument, except for references to the differences between nuclear-capable aircraft and missiles. The USSR then agreed to keep exactly as many missiles as those possessed by Britain and France, provided that the numbers of nuclear-capable aircraft were equal. Finally, removing NATO's last objections, the Soviet Union agreed to reach agreement on equality, both in nuclear weapon delivery vehicles (missiles and aircraft) and in their charges. If the West agreed to this proposal, the USSR would have significantly fewer medium-range nuclear systems in its European zone than it had prior to 1976, when, let us note, nobody was shouting about "Soviet superiority."

The level of our new major move was formulated in Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's answers to questions put by PRAVDA. If the United States renounces the deployment of the new missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union, in reducing its medium-range missiles in the European part of the country to a level equal to the number of British and French missiles, will destroy all the missiles subject to reduction. Thus, a significant number of the most modern missiles, designated SS-20's in the West, would be destroyed.

The Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee has pointed out that if agreement is not reached at the talks by the end of this year, it is essential that talks should continue with the purpose of achieving agreement in the conditions of the renunciation by the United States and its NATO allies of the schedules they have set for deployment of the new medium-range missiles.

But the stances of the militarist circles of the United States and NATO are determined by their stubborn intention of using the European Continent for the preparation and possible unleashing of a "limited" nuclear war. This will allow the transatlantic power, as the present American President once let slip, to remain aloof from the nuclear whirlwind, and will also present it with an advantageous bridgehead for carrying out a nuclear first strike against vitally important Soviet centers and strategic targets from close range, guaranteeing high destructive accuracy.

In order to achieve this, the United States, which began work on the relevant missiles back in the late sixties, has imposed the decision to deploy them on its West European allies. The Pershing II nuclear missiles are capable of delivering a strike within 5-6 minutes, and they are being made ready for deployment at the socialist countries' very borders -- in the FRG. The decision was concealed behind the fig leaf of "arms upgrading" and an accompanying paragraph about relevant talks with the Soviet side. The "talks," like the myth of "arms upgrading," have turned out to be camouflage designed to deliberately and maliciously deceive public opinion. It was claimed that the decision to deploy new missiles was needed by the White House in order to achieve Senate ratification of the Soviet-American SALT treaty. Servile propagandists and West European governments subservient to Washington represented the "two-track decision" as a "step toward arms limitation." One month after its adoption the American Government itself withdrew the treaty from the Senate.

And what about talks with the USSR? For a full 2 years the United States, involved in the production and testing of first-strike missiles, obstinately avoided even a discussion of them. It took pressure from the peace-loving public and polite coaxing by the capitals of the European allies to get Washington to finally agree to talks; and it was not long before they started that it announced its notorious "zero option." Its nature is vividly expressed by the following words: zero missiles for the USSR and zero reductions for the United States. While demanding that the Soviet Union reduce and liquidate all its medium-range missiles, the United States keeps for itself and for its NATO allies the existing medium-range nuclear forces -- all the U.S. delivery aircraft (and there are around 700 of them) and all the British and French land- and sea-based nuclear missiles. They can drop 3,000 nuclear charges simultaneously in the European part of the USSR as far as the Urals.

The obvious flaw in the "zero option" did not prevent Washington and, echoing it, Bonn, London, and Rome from extolling the "courage" of the United States, which is allegedly prepared to take vital steps in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. But the public would not swallow the poisonous propaganda.

So Washington displayed a new "flexibility": It proposed the reduction of Soviet medium-range missiles by a certain number, not only in the European part but also in the Asian part of the USSR, and the deployment of a certain number of U.S. missiles in addition to the vast arsenal of nuclear weapons NATO already has in Europe. This "interim" option, as the West has called it, which will weaken Soviet defense and strengthen the offensive positions of U.S. first-strike nuclear weapons, is now being used as the main propaganda trump by all U.S. and Washington-orchestrated West European news media. And the more reactionary the attitudes of their owners, the harder they try to portray the U.S. side as "flexible."

It is surprising but true that statesmen and politicians in the FRG, British, Italy, and France are extolling this option with the same zeal as the paid NATO propagandists. In recent weeks the FRG federal chancellor and foreign minister have expressed support for the U.S. position on more than one occasion. Although Bonn vows its commitment to nuclear disarmament, the FRG Government has done practically nothing to ensure the achievement of mutually acceptable accords at the Geneva talks on the basis of equality and identical security. On the contrary, its behavior, the numerous speeches attacking Soviet positions and policy, and the persecution of opponents of nuclear weapons on German soil naturally raise the question: Is it not trying to restore Bonn to the role of chief champion of aggressive and militarist U.S. policy in the European Continent that it played in the days of Adenauer? The present FRG leaders keep on plugging their "steadfast determination" to deploy U.S. missiles in the country. The federal chancellor saw fit to publicly boast that they would be deployed in the FRG even if West Germans have to view their Eastern neighbors "through a forest of missiles."

The fact is that if Bonn makes its territory available for the preparation of a U.S. first strike, it is effectively joining in preparations for a nuclear war in Europe. Efforts to conceal its involvement with phony talk about NATO's earlier "two-track decision" and about "Allied commitments" are designed to deceive West German and European public opinion.

The correlation of forces between those who are seeking to intensify the nuclear arms race and those who are struggling to curb nuclear arms and lower the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe is highly indicative. The U.S. ruling elite, whose aim is to turn Europe into an arena of "limited" nuclear war, has right-wing reactionary and militarist circles in other NATO countries on its side as well as the U.S. military industrial monopolies.

In contrast to these forces the broadest masses of the people are becoming increasingly adamant in their demands for an immediate and total halt to the nuclear arms race, for the nondeployment of the new U.S. missiles and the achievement of an accord in Geneva on limiting and reducing all types of nuclear armaments with the ultimate aim of banning and destroying nuclear weapons. Millions and millions of people in all the European countries, in the United States, Japan, and Canada are participating in the antiwar, antinuclear movement. The autumn of 1983, at the end of which Washington and its accomplices in Western Europe intend to deploy the U.S. nuclear missiles, has already become "hot" for the militarists.

It has become a particularly stormy fall in the FRG. The West German population is rebelling against the prospect of becoming the Pentagon's hostage.

"The peoples of our countries," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov said in his reply to a group of FRG Bundestag Social Democratic deputies, "know the horrors of war and the value of peace. They are resolutely against a return to the cold war, and they cannot sit by while attempts are being made for the sake of interests alien to Europe to wipe out everything positive that has been created through the joint efforts of Eastern and Western countries in Europe for the sake of a peaceful future for our continent."

...Senior officials in Washington and some of their obsequious myrmidons are full of wanton lies. They keep saying that the sooner the deployment of the new U.S. missiles starts, the sooner the USSR will make concessions in Geneva. But we have never made and never will make any concessions jeopardizing the security of our country and its allies.

"The goodwill of the Soviet Union and its wish to reach agreement should not be taken for a sign of weakness," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's statement points out. "Any attempt to disrupt the existing strategic military balance will encounter an appropriate response from the Soviet Union, and its words and deeds will never be at variance." The remaining months of the year will be decisive not only for the Geneva talks but also for the struggle of the forces acting in defense of Europe's future. Decisive intervention by all the people may help to stop the Washington nuclear madmen and prevent the continent from taking yet another step toward the nuclear precipice.

'RESPONSIBLE' SOVIET DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS ITEMIZED

PM251155 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 4

[APN political observer S. Beglov article: "Disarmament: This Could Have Been Done Already"]

[Text] There are a whole set of proposals for restraining the arms race on the agenda of the United Nations and the Disarmament Committee. Most of them were put forward by the Soviet Union.

It is also significant that at the same time the United States has proposed nothing constructive on these questions. Moreover, at the last, 37th, UN General Assembly session the American delegate contrived to vote with the minority in 21 of the 25 resolutions on one or another disarmament measure.

How can one explain the fact, the reader will ask, that the Americans will even take the risk of isolation in their desire to block the solution of problems vitally important for all mankind? It is important to establish something else too: What real advantage -- in the sense of a weakening of the arms race and the threat of war -- would the world gain from the implementation of the Soviet proposals if the American obstacles were taken out of the way?

We will try first to answer this second question. Let us imagine that the steps proposed by our country over the last few years had been adopted. Here is what the international situation would look like in that case.

--A ban on all types of nuclear weapons tests. And this means that the improvement or development of qualitatively new types of nuclear arms has ceased.
--Neutron weapons outlawed.
--A complete ban on chemical weapons, and steps undertaken to remove them from arsenals and destroy them.
--A barrier placed in the way of developing new nuclear weapons delivery systems.
--Existing nuclear arsenals frozen. After a halt was called to production of the means of nuclear war, the unhindered transition to reducing them became possible.

--Near-earth space closed to the arms race and to the threat of the use of force from space.
--An international veto on the doctrines of "possible" and "lawful" nuclear arms.
--A common commitment by the nuclear powers not to be the first to use nuclear weapons has come into force. And if the threat of a first strike is removed, and with it that of a second strike, then the threat of nuclear war as such no longer arises.
--The Soviet-proposed "Nuclear Disarmament Program" with its step-by-step measures to ban production and scrap stocks of nuclear weapons, which is currently being examined by the Committee on Disarmament, is coming into force.
--The five permanent members of the UN Security Council have implemented the first reductions in military budgets. The resources freed are turned over to civilian needs and, partially, to aid for the developing countries in the interests of eliminating economic backwardness, disease, hunger, and poverty.

This may be far from a full list of everything arising out of the Soviet propoasls that have been approved by most UN members. Nonetheless, the general scheme of our policy and the consistency of its implementation are quite obvious: namely, to call a halt to the arms race and switch to the track of steps to reduce arsenals and promote disarmament.

This manifestation of a supreme sense of responsibility for the world's fate is combined with profound fairness in the approach to all states' interests.

In this connection it is appropriate once again to quote the following words from the statement by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andorpov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium: "We do not separate our people's prosperity and the Soviet state's security, and still less do we set them against the prosperity and security of other peoples and other countries. In the nuclear age you cannot peer at the world through narrow, egoistic interests. Responsible statesmen have one choice -- to do everything to prevent a nuclear catastrophe."

If one now returns to the question of the American position, the main thing is precisely that the U.S. leadership is still trying to challenge this choice. And not only to challenge it, but also to act on the principle of wishing on others what it would not wish on itself, and to attempt to safeguard its own military designs at the expense of the security of others.

Hence the contrary approaches to the talks. While all the Soviet initiatives and proposals are invariably in the spirit of the principle of equality and identical security, the American side is prepared to use any trick to get around that principle and leave loopholes to implement its own plans of pushing ahead with rearmament and the modernization of its arsenal.

One can quote the authoritative testimonies of many sober-minded Americans as confirmation. Here are just two of them. Characterizing the "justification" for Reagan's latest proposals at the strategic arms limitation talks, Elton Fry, director of the American International Relations Council, writes that every one of the assurances intended to reinforce the arguments in favor of an accelerated modernization of strategic forces is either false or creates a completely wrong impression. John (Oshs), author of articles in THE NEW YORK TIMES: stresses: "Reagan does not fear taking a risk for the sake of war, but he is thoroughly incapable of taking a risk for the sake of peace."

To shut out from the talks the insatiable nuclear ambitions of the present U.S. ruling grouping, intoxicated with pathological anti-Sovietism, is, it turns out, the "risk" that the Reagan administration cannot bring itself to take. It cannot do it, even in order to enable mankind to step back from the brink of the nuclear abyss!

The diplomatic calendar happened to be arranged so that at the time that President Reagan put forward his scheme to "build up" new arms while "reducing" old ones, and unblushingly giving this the form of a "proposal at the Geneva talks", the Soviet Union submitted as urgent and important items on the agenda of the 38th UN General Assembly Session the questions of "Denouncing Nuclear War" and "Freezing Nuclear Weapons."

The reasoning behind this decisive new Soviet foreign policy step is to mobilize mankind's reason and conscience in the struggle against the nuclear danger. "Mankind deserves a better fate than to live in a world torn asunder by conflicts, gasping under the burden of lethal weapons," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov stresses in his statement. Our choice has long since been made: to preserve and strengthen peace and curb the arms race. For the sake of this, our country will continue to do everything possible and necessary.

ARBATOV INTERVIEWED ON INF, DETENTE, KAL, CHINA

DW250909 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German 24 Oct 83 pp 154-161

[Interview with Georgiy Arbatov, director of the USSR United States of America and Canada Institute, by editors Andreas Lorenz, Dieter Wild, and Fritjof Meyer in Moscow -- date not given]

[Text] SPIEGEL: Mr Arbatov, in East-West relations at present, there is apparently only one issue of importance -- what will the Soviet Union do if NATO begins deploying U.S. intermediate-range missiles in Europe?

Arbatov: This question certainly does have a depressing military and political significance. It may become a decisive turning point between two political eras.

SPIEGEL: What will the new era look like?

Arbatov: If the Geneva negotiations fail and the deployment of American missiles begins, then I simply do not see any possibility that the negotiations could be continued. In addition, a heavy blow would be dealt to politics and the idea of detente. A new stage of the arms race would begin and the international situation would deteriorate even further. We do not want this, but we also do not see any way to avoid it after the Americans have begun deploying their missiles.

SPIEGEL: Will you interrupt or will you break off the Geneva negotiations? The Americans have actually proposed that the negotiations simply be continued.

Arbatov: Well, you know, the Americans even say that genuine negotiations will only start after the first Pershing II and cruise missiles have been deployed. However, this is an error. The purpose of the negotiations was to prevent a new stage in the arms race. However, if deployment begins, this will mean that the negotiations have failed. What are we supposed to talk about in that case?

SPIEGEL: About withdrawing the U.S. missiles which have been deployed, for instance.

Arbatov: Isn't it somewhat silly to deploy missiles first, and negotiate on their withdrawal afterwards?

SPIEGEL: Negotiations are in fact being held on the SS-20's to the extent that this is required, but these negotiations must also deal with all NATO weapons in Europe -- the French and British missiles, aircraft, and so forth. What the Americans actually want is nothing other than an agreement that will force us to our knees and cause our collapse through an arms race. This is called blackmail, and we will not conduct negotiations if we are the subject of blackmail.

SPIEGEL: The Soviet Union should be interested in continuing the negotiations to get rid of the American missiles which it considers so very threatening. You certainly do not mean to say that you will never again hold talks on arms limitation in Europe.

Arbatov: If you are conducting negotiations to prevent war and this war breaks out, then you can hardly say that nothing has changed. Perhaps there will be other negotiations later on. At any rate, our response to the deployment of American missiles will not be new proposals, but new missiles. This is only logical, and we have stated it repeatedly.

SPIEGEL: On various occasions, the Soviet Union has threatened that it will respond to the deployment of U.S. missiles by increasing the missile threat against West Europe, by increasing the missile threat against the United States proper, and by eventually also creating a new antimissiles system. Which one of these possibilities can we expect first?

Arbatov: To begin with, I want to say that we are only warning, not threatening. In connection with an antimissiles system, it must be said that this belongs to the realm of fantasy. We are strictly abiding by the agreements we have concluded and we are against setting up antimissile systems. The question of what we are going to do is a military secret that I am not privy to and that I would not be allowed to reveal to you even if I did not it. In any event, we will make a response.

SPIEGEL: Is it conceivable that the two sides will admit to the failure of the negotiations in Geneva while simultaneously agreeing to continue discussing the matter at the START negotiations?

Arbatov: All that actually represents variant attempts to compel us to accept American weapons and, what is more, to give them our blessing in one way or another. However, we do not intend to do this, and we will not do it. We will perhaps not be able to prevent deployment, but in that case the United States, the Federal Republic, and the other NATO states will be fully responsible.

SPIEGEL: The Federal Republic cannot actually be held responsible because it is not sitting at the negotiating table.

Arbatov: The United States is negotiating on behalf of all NATO states, and the United States says that it did not make the initiative for the counterarmament decision, but that it was actually the Federal Republic -- and this is at least partially correct. For this reason, it is not just the United States alone which will be held responsible for a failure of the negotiations. As a matter of fact, the FRG is taking particular pride in being the most loyal ally of the United States. For this reason, it cannot raise any claim for special treatment by us.

SPIEGEL: It hasn't done that.

Arbatov: At any rate, Europe's linking up to the United States, which is now being carried out, has a quite different nature than that which had been talked about so much. Washington is now pursuing a linkup to the policy of cold war, to the policy of the current rightist-extremist U.S. Administration. You have to also accept the consequences of that.

SPIEGEL: Is it really surprising for the smaller alliance partners of the two superpowers to also be affected by the changes in climate between the big powers? Can there be detente between the FRG and, say, the GDR when a cold war exists between the Soviet Union and the United States?

Arbatov: You must not assess the power ratio within NATO in the same way as before and say that there is the all-powerful United States and the small, poor, and weak allies. Judging by their economic strength, above all by their gross national products, as well as by the strength of their conventional armed forces, the allies of the United States have become very strong and are no weaker than the United States.

However, this is not the most important thing. What matters above all is everyone's survival. For this reason, not even the smallest NATO and Warsaw Pact states can simply look on while the situation worsens dangerously. As a matter of fact, the FRG and other NATO states have gotten Washington to use different words for the past few years.

SPIEGEL: That is something in itself.

Arbatov: Well, some speeches made in Washington sound rather peaceable, whereas other speeches continue to be as harsh as ever. However, the ideas and the policies pursued by the Reagan administration have in no way changed.

SPIEGEL: A majority of the West German people is against the deployment of Pershing missiles, but all the FRG people would be against them if no Soviet SS-20's existed. Therefore, we ask: How we can get rid of the SS-20's?

Arbatov: I want to tell you that if you could talk your British and French alliance partners into scrapping their intermediate-range missiles, and if your American alliance partner were not to bring any intermediate-range missiles to Europe, then we wouldn't need to have any SS-20's. Of course, this would also require a solution to the problem of the other intermediate-range weapons.

SPIEGEL: You mean that all SS-20's would be scrapped?

Arbatov: Yes. In addition, we have repeatedly proposed that Federal Republic ought to be particularly interested in this because it certainly feels threatened not only by the SS-20's, but also -- as I understand -- by the short-range missiles, bombers, and the other theater nuclear weapons which would be used on FRG territory in the even of a military conflict.

SPIEGEL: The withdrawal of all nuclear weapons from central Europe has been a Soviet demand, a maximum demand, for years now, and has often been rejected by the West. On the other hand, the Americans have raised their own maximum demand -- the withdrawal of all intermediate-range nculear missiles.

Arbatov: Not all of them, just those of the Soviet Union.

SPIEGEL: The American weapons do not actually exist yet.

Arbatov: We have to deal not just with the Americans, but with NATO as well. In all other cases, they count the combined strength of NATO units, such as the conventional forces. In this regard the Americans fully rely on the Units of their allies. Why then are the British and French missiles not to be counted?

SPIEGEL: Because they are also strategic weapons which don't necessarily have be discussed at negotiations on intermediate-range weapons.

Arbatov: That is nothing but playing with semantics. It actually makes no difference for us if we are hit by a British, French, or American missile. We also cannot imagine that France or Britain would wage a nuclear war of their own against the Soviet Union. The French, for example, have been using American satellites for a long time to plan the targets for their missiles, and the targets of British weapons continue to be programmed in Omaha in the United States.

SPIEGEL: Still, the British and French missiles were described as strategic weapons not by the West, but by Leonid Brezhnev, the Soviet general secretary at the time, when he discussed the subject with German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt.

Arbatov: That was a misunderstanding. I did not attend the talks, but people who were present have made it clear that something was misunderstood at the time. In any event, Brezhnev did not mean it that way, because no negotiations on intermediate-range missiles had taken place yet. Maybe it was meant to say that such negotiations should take place.

SPIEGEL: All the more reason for the Soviet Union to actually continue negotiations on the British and French nuclear weapons, even if things fail in Geneva.

Arbatov: However, the American missiles can't be deployed in Europe in December while negotiations on the British and French missiles continue into the next century; and there is hardly any optimism regarding the situation at the START negotiations.

SPIEGEL: According to one view expressed in the West, the Soviet demand that the British and French intermediate-range weapons also be counted is fully legitimate. What strikes us, however, is that the Soviet Union has never demanded a reduction in the number of these British and French missiles. Rather, it has been saying all along that not a single American intermediate-range missile must be deployed in Europe. For many West Europeans, this sounds as though the Soviet Union is demanding an assurance from West that the United States will never be allowed to deploy one single intermediate-range missile in Europe. Is that so?

Arbatov: No, we would also be against any other NATO state wanting to deploy its own Pershing II's. You have to keep in mind that there is a difference between the French and the American missiles -- the American missiles are not planned for the defense of Europe; they are first-strike weapons which are supposed to make the famous decapitating strike against the Soviet Union -- they are to destroy our command and communications centers, while the big MX and Trident II missiles are to finish off what is left. All this is interconnected; it is a single absurd plan.

SPIEGEL: The threat of a decapitating strike that you fear could have been removed through the so-called "compromise of the walk in the woods" in Geneva, according to which the Americans were to renounce deploying the Pershing missiles, while the Soviet Union was to keep 75 launching pads for the SS-20's -- exactly the same number which the Americans were to have for the cruise missiles. Why didn't the Soviet Union accept this compromise? It appears now that agreement has never been so close as at that time.

Arbatov: It only seems so. It was nothing but small talk by the American negotiator, Nitze.

SPIEGEL: And of your negotiator, Kvitsinskiy.

Arbatov: No, Kvitsinskiy only listened.

SPIEGEL: The proposal was not introduced at the negotiations?

Arbatov: Never.

SPIEGEL: Would there be a new situation for the Soviet side if the United States were induced to introduce the "walk in the woods" compromise into the negotiations at the very last minute?

Arbatov: What would that mean for us? The Americans would then have 300 cruise missiles, the French and British would keep everything they have, American aircraft would continue to threaten us, and we would have to destroy almost 200 of our missiles. This is a deal fully in line with American horse-trading, but is no compromise in our view.

SPIEGEL: However, it would perhaps facilitate the negotiations in Geneva. The Pershings, which you consider to be a decapitation weapon, would have been done away with and then understanding might some day be achieved on the cruise missiles.

Arbatov: Come on, don't try to pretend that the cruise missiles are harmless. Although they fly more slowly, they are hard to detect, very accurate, and can approach their targets from different directions. In other words, they are a very dangerous weapon. The Americans have actually been very clever in always speaking only about how dangerous the SS-20's are.

SPIEGEL: As a matter of fact, in West Europe the SS-20's are viewed as a threat which is specifically directed against the Europeans, and less against the Americans.

Arbatov: I do not want to praise any weapon, not even the SS-20. Viewed from the strategic point of view, it is nothing new, and cannot be taken for a first-strike weapon. Just think for a while about what would be the "hard targets" for the SS-20's [redacted] for the 18 French nuclear missiles, there are no other targets. We have no intention at all of waging a first strike against Europe. This would also be impossible because West Europe is an ally of the United States.

SPIEGEL: If you intend to target your SS-20's only against the 18 French nuclear missiles, then you certainly have deployed a rather large number of them. They also enable you to eliminate the NATO Headquarters in Belgium; the U.S. Headquarters in Europe; and the defense ministries in London, Paris and Bonn -- that is, you could wage a so-called decapitating strike against West Europe.

Arbatov: All that could also have been done with the old SS-4's and SS-5's, and NATO was not very concerned about them.

SPIEGEL: Then perhaps the SS-20's are needed for use on submarines cruising off the American coast to threaten the U.S. command and communications centers in the same way the Americans threaten Soviet centers with their Pershings deployed in Europe?

Arbatov: I have already said that I cannot talk about military secrets. Even if we were to also threaten American territory in response to the Pershing II's, the European states must not fancy that they would be playing the role of innocent children. When they first joined NATO, the European states placed themselves in the position of being a potential enemy of the USSR. Two of these states have acquired their own nuclear weapons, which, we assume, are not aimed at the United States.

Thus, we must take the appropriate measures. However, we have also proposed that a nonuse of force agreement be concluded between the Warsaw Pact states and NATO, which would bring about a radical change in the basis of relations between the two parts of Europe.

SPIEGEL: All UN member states have already renounced the use of force by signing the UN Charter.

Arbatov: Well, yes, the UN Charter envisages many things which would provide a happy life to the community of peoples. However, with all due respect to the United Nations, we must also say that so far this has not helped much. In the 1970 treaty between the USSR and the FRG, there is also talk of the renunciation of force, although both states belong to the United Nations. The same thing applies to the Helsinki Final Act.

SPIEGEL: Mr Arbatov, during the Geneva negotiations, the Soviet Union submitted a number of moratorium proposals. It also offered to reduce the number of SS-20's and to eventually even scrap some of them. Wouldn't it have been better -- with a view to public opinion in the West -- for Moscow instead to have stopped the production or the deployment of its SS-20 missiles? This is precisely what the Soviet Union apparently did not want to do. Instead, it has continued deployment throughout the negotiations. Why weren't you in a position to make up your mind to make a concession, as has now also been demanded by SPD leader Willy Brandt?

Arbatov: One of these moratorium proposals would actually have amounted to such a concession. We were prepared to deploy no additional SS-20's if ....

SPIEGEL: ...the Americans were to forego deployment.

Arbatov: They weren't prepared to do that in the winter of 1981. This is why we did not expect any corresponding commitment from the other side in connection with our unilateral commitment arising from the moratorium. However, it was rejected by the Americans and NATO. Their only objective was to deploy their missiles at all costs, in conformity with their entire political course. They have greatly increased their arms expenditures and unleashed a propaganda war against us.

SPIEGEL: Is General Secretary Andropov's proposal still valid according to which the number of SS-20's will be reduced to less than 150 if the Pershing II missiles are not deployed?

Arbatov: Yes, just as is our proposal that the negotiations be continued if deployment does not take place.

SPIEGEL: However, there are differing statements by Soviet representatives.

Arbatov: You see, you underrate the freedom of opinion on our side.

SPIEGEL: If the Pershing II's are deployed, this will also constitute a defeat for Soviet diplomatic which wanted to prevent this deployment. You once said that Washington is now playing with fire....

Arbatov: Yes, the danger of war would increase. Viewed from the purely military aspect, we will make a response. However, after deployment, we will all soon find ouselves in a world that has become more insecure as a consequence of the countermeasures and the other possible responses and counterreactions.

SPIEGEL: Has the Soviet Union possibly made mistakes, for instance, in its assessment of the West? Hasn't it overrated the peace movement in the belief that this movement, which in the meantime has become a powerful political force, would prevent counter-armament so that substantial concessions at the negotiating table would be unnecessary?

Arbatov: No. The peace movement has become an important factor, and this is now also understood by President Reagan. All the changes in his policy were aimed at this movement. The American Government will only be good to the extent it is not allowed to be bad; it can only be peaceful to the extent it is not allowed to be dangerous. Just compare the American attitude toward SALT II before and after the appearance of the peace movement.

However, we have never believed that the peace movement would be able to replace serious negotiations. We have also tied our hopes to the wisdom and experience of politicians. After all, wise politicians have to tackle the question of what it means to live with the bomb. History cannot be deceived.

SPIEGEL: In your view, are the Germans trying to do this?

Arbatov: I feel that the Federal Government will now do what the American Government wants. However, it is risky for politicians to ignore what is happening at the grassroots level.

SPIEGEL: How do you analyze the currently poor state of East-West relations? Is the time of detente now gone for good? Are we in the middle of a cold war?

Arbatov: I believe that the United States has now embarked on a road which endangers peace....

SPIEGEL: You also said that about President Carter's administration.

Arbatov: You know, the United States was the first country to produce the bomb and it is the only country which has used it so far. Its politicians were the first to consider how one could -- live with the bomb. I can see a dangerous development for decades to come.

Nuclear weapons constitute a revolution, not only militarily and strategically, but also politically. The new facts are clear to everyone: Ever since nuclear weapons have existed, war can no longer be waged and we have had to say goodbye to the tradition of wars and to the deification of military force which have existed for centuries. However, many American politicians and military men have been trying for decades to get out of this situation of stalemate. Carter....

SPIEGEL: ...who assumed office with good intentions...

Arbatov: ... together with his Defense Secretary Brown then strove for a serious change -- just think of his Directive No 59 on the feasibility of war and on limited nuclear war! Just think of the new weapons systems!

The United States now has an administration which is oriented toward tension instead of detente, toward distrust and slander. The dangerous development of military thinking and the giant armament programs, on the one hand, as well as extremist elements in the U.S. Government, on the other, have produced a highly explosive mixture.

SPIEGEL: As an expert on America, you know that Reagan was the result rather than the cause of a certain development -- America felt itself humiliated by enemies abroad -- by the USSR, by Ayatollah Khomeyni....

Arbatov: ...by German Social Democrats....

SPIEGEL: ...or by European media. The feeling arose that America must no longer allow itself to be bossed around. Did you, as one who is knowledgeable of American conditions, see that this was going to happen?

Arbatov: In one way or the other, yes. The Americans have given themselves quite a few catastrophic presidents. They experienced Watergate and had to discover that some politicians who professed to be extremely concerned about public morality were crooks (English expression used -- DER SPIEGEL). Among rightist extremists, there are quite often crooks -- dating back to the Joe McCarthy era. Or perhaps crooks often become rightist extremists?

SPIEGEL: Examples exist.

Arbatov: But, it is not only crooks. The Americans also had their bad experiences with Carter. I do not know how they are assessing the current Presidency. However, as far as the U.S. policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union is concerned, above all in regard to the issue of war or peace, today's administration is the most dangerous in several decades. However, I would like to add that I agree with what Henry Kissinger recently told your paper: "We are condemned to coexistence."

SPIEGEL: Indeed, you must get along with this America which perhaps will be governed for another four years by a President Reagan; with a Federal Republic whose chancellor's name may be Kohl for 8 or 12 years to come; with an England for which still many years under Maggie Thatcher may be in store. How do you want to cope with such an environment?

Arbatov: I am not so pessimistic and I do not reckon that the most unfavorable possibility will happen. I am also careful. I would not have remained chief of the United States Institute for more than 15 years had I ventured any forecast on the result of a Presidency earlier than one year prior to a presidential election. Precisely now, when there is one scandal after the other and a very unstable economic situation in America, such forecasts must not be made. Besides, I cannot imagine that this President will be in a position any longer to do something bad.

SPIEGEL: But neither something good.

Arabatov: I really do not expect something of this sort from the current administration. The time has come now that the boy from Andersen's fairy tale stands up and points out that the emperor is without clothes. We are facing difficult times when it, however, will become increasingly clear that additional weapons do not spell more security, that cooperation is inalienable and that security is indivisible.

SPIEGEL: However, this precisely is what you cannot expect of the incumbent U.S. Government.

Arabatov: The pressure from below will possibly increase. Ever more Americans do not want this course of confrontation.

SPIEGEL: The rhetoric of the current American Administration sometimes appears more extreme than its policy: Russia is supposed to be the center of evil" in the world, and the Soviet system is to perish "not with a bang but a whimper"...

Arabatov: ...these godless communists ...

SPIEGEL: Does it annoy you that Communists are called godless? There are, after all, more Christians than members of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union.

Arabatov: That is the counting of DER SPIEGEL.

SPIEGEL: Washington basically contests the Soviet Union's right to exist legitimately, to safeguard its own interests; and it even denies it, so to speak, its ideological coexistence. This seems to irritate your side although it always has said the same about capitalism: Even during the best times of detente you have always denied the West its ideological coexistence. Now the Americans are turning the tables and you feel offended.

Arbatov: In the past as well as we certainly never behaved the way you just described. However, what is more important is: In matters of faith anybody is entitled to an opinion of his own. We are convinced that socialism is the better cause. However, the decision must be made by every country for itself -- without any assistance from outside, without exporting the revolution and without war.

General Secretary Andropov has stated recently that ideological controversies must not be transferred into the field of foreign policy. Ideological differences do not necessarily trigger the threat of war. Was World War I an ideological war? No, it was waged between states with the same social order and the same self-interpretation. In World War II the socialist Soviet Union was allied with the capitalist United States....

SPIEGEL: War exists even between socialist states, as for instance between China and Vietnam, Vietnam and Cambodia; and for some time the communist great power China even believed that it would be attacked by the communist great power Soviet Union.

Arbatov: I personally do not believe that the Chinese considered us that insane to do something of this sort, but perhaps they have talked themselves into this fear for a certain time.

SPIEGEL: Shots were fired, after all, at the Ussuri River.

Arbatov: It has been a limited conflict. Meanwhile, however, the Chinese, like us, do not believe that there will be war between us. This is quite a change, which perhaps will make other changes possible.

SPIEGEL: Then you must make the Chinese get rid of the feeling that you want to encircle them.

Arbatov: Throughout this world everybody feels encircled by everybody, with the sole exception of the United States, which is encircled by only Canada and Mexico. Nonetheless it sometimes is getting quite nervous only because of Nicaragua and Cuba. With the -- in the best sense of the word -- pragmatic policy of the present Chinese leadership it will be possible to normalize and develop relations between the two states.

SPIEGEL: The Soviet Union actually is offered the big chance of checking Reagan's aggressive policy: Any compromise between Moscow and Beijing must cause a nightmare in Washington.

Arbatov: We consider our relations with China something very fundamental and by no means only a tactical measure aimed at how we are to face the American policy. China is our neighbor with whom we share a common border extending over several thousands of kilometers. China could become one of the most important factors in the policy of detente. No objective reasons existed for our former disputes with China. In addition, the dispute was dangerous for all.

SPIEGEL: But this was not the fault of the Americans, or was it?

Arbatov: Granted, it was not the fault of the Americans, but they have taken great efforts so as to derive benefit from our confrontations.

SPIEGEL: One cannot blame them, after all. What is in your view the long-term aim pursued by the American policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union?

Arbatov: The by far most important problem in today's world policy is that the incumbent U.S. Administration is seeking confrontation with us in the economic, technological, ideological, and possibly also military sectors and that it tries to couple its allies to this policy. This breaking with the U.S. policy of the seventies is the main cause for the current tension in the world.

SPIEGEL: At the same time, however, this U.S. Government also helps to feed this "center of evil" in the world with grain deliveries.

Arbatov: Its help is not intended for the Soviet Union but for the American farmers. However, in principle this indicates the state of interdependence which exists already today, but the Americans do not want to admit it. There exist more than a dozen agreements between us and them, more than half of which meanwhile have expired and must be prolonged -- but they do not show any interest.

Relations are drying up to almost nothing, whereas the arms race is escalating. The Americans are obviously striving for superiority instead of balance, and we have gained the impression that they also want to become capable of waging a first strike against the Soviet Union. We cannot allow them to do so.

SPIEGEL: Even the most vehement cold warriors in America cannot hope to be in a position to do so.

Arbatov: Hope is one thing; a different one, however, is the intention to increase the armament budget enormously and to get the other side into great economic trouble. Although you and I know that a first strike is impossible objectively, the illusion alone that it can be waged is dangerous for stability.

SPIEGEL: There exists, however, a countermovement. You yourself have mentioned the American opposition against the course. What must be added is the resistance by the Europeans, who irrespective of the pressure exerted by Washington stuck to the natural-gas deal with Moscow. They did not participate in any economic boycott against the Soviet Union, and in the area of rhetoric the USSR gave the Americans tit for tat....

Arbatov: We simply said what nobody can contest, that an extremist government is in power in Washington.

SPIEGEL: You have said that the American President is lying and deceiving.

Arbatov: This is what he actually does.

SPIEGEL: That is new vocabulary, you have never said this before about a U.S. head of state.

Arbatov: We have restrained ourselves.

SPIEGEL: After the downing of the South Korean civil aircraft over Sakhalin, Washington, too, was rather restrained. President Reagan did not do what extremists from the right wing of his Republican Party demanded: To recall the U.S. ambassador from Moscow and to break off negotiations in Geneva....

Arbatov: I do not think that the American reaction was restrained at all. Reagan said immediately that there can be no discussions at all with such people. May be he was told later on that it is better to continue negotiations with the USSR so as to make the Americans believe that the United States is absolutely guiltless regarding the failure of the negotiations. However, Reagan also exploited this tragic incident with a view to making his arms program prevail in Congress.

SPIEGEL: We ask you personally: Was it correct or wrong to shoot down the jumbo jet?

Arbatov: The question is posed in such an alternative way that the answer, however I may formulate it, might be interpreted against us. This is why it cannot be answered by a yes or no. But let me point out the following fact: Nobody in the USSR knew that the jumbo was a passenger plane.

SPIEGEL: It has even shocked friends of the Soviet Union that such an error was possible.

Arbatov: He who is looking out for a secret object and is asked to stop it but does not comply with this demand is running the risk that shots are being fired. This is how it is.

SPIEGEL: Thus, a local commander would be able to trigger a conflict, maybe even atomic war?

Arbatov: Why?

SPEIGEL: If, for instance, the vice president of the United States together with 20 senators had been on board the downed aircraft, then perhaps a third world war might have been in the offing.

Arbatov: If the vice president of the United States were to cross the Soviet border without having informed us, then I would not understand his behavior and it could be assumed that he had evil intentions. Moreover, if the aircraft happened to be a bomber which was supposed to move from the first flight lane into our air defense system with atom bombs, what were we supposed to do then?

SPIEGEL: In the European part of the Soviet Union, close to Leningrad or Moscow, one perhaps might say: Shoot! However, is it so tragic when an individual plane violates the border the vastness of Siberia?

Arbatov: We have very important, strictly secret military objects there. You ought to understand: I am against it -- and Soviet people in general are against it -- that shots are being fired, that people are being killed in Lebanon, Nicaragua, El Salvador and naturally also over Sakhalin. However, one must not hold responsible the pilot of the interceptor plane or those who gave the orders to him. Responsible are those who have triggered tension in the world, who have caused the arms race and the feeling for being threatened, so that one must react immediately and without any hesitation. Now they are even trying to exploit this incident propagandistically.

SPIEGEL: How would the Soviet Union have reacted had the United States shot down, for instance, a Cuban aircraft with a large number of Soviet citizens aboard? Wouldn't you have exploited it, too? And if the Americans then had answered the Russian reproaches in a similar way as you do now, namely: "We are against it, anyway, that people are being killed in Afghanistan and in Cambodia," you then certainly would have rejected such argumentation with indignation.

Arbatov: In any event we would not exploit such an incident so as to increase tension even further in this dangerous period of time; and by the way, the Americans in fact are doing evil things with Cuban planes.

SPIEGEL: However, they do not shoot them down.

Arbatov: Well, but bombs had already been planted. As for the jumbo incident: There have been too many suspicious indications, such as the plane's deviation from its regular course by some 600 kilometers; the simultaneous flight of another jet, which could have falsified wireless radio communication; the simultaneous flight of a number of U.S. reconnaissance planes, and the coinciding with an espionage satellite.

We have strict rules on how the responsible organs of our armed forces have to react to border violators and these rules are known to all states. It may be said that these rules are also a consequence of the tension and arms race in the world. How have Norway and Sweden actually reacted to an alleged Soviet submarine? With depth charges!

SPIEGEL: Well, there do not exist civilian submarines, to be sure, but what exists is civilian aircraft in large numbers. Who actually has made the decision for the shooting?

Arbatov: Marshal Ogarkov explained it already, that it was the regional anti-aircraft commander.

SPIEGEL: Is it really correct that a military authority makes such a decision instead of a political authority, as had been the case in 1960 when the U-2 aircraft was downed?

Arbatov: In cases like this we cannot always convene the Central Committee's plenum.

SPIEGEL: Wouldn't it perhaps be necessary also in the Soviet Union that the Soviet military people be kept in their bounds sometimes?

Arbatov: There is no single incident in Soviet history when the military would have tried to pursue a policy of its own, nor does it want to do so.

SPIEGEL: Soviet officers, too, have considered that an atomic war could be won. In the meantime the political leadership has declared this view nonsense and even "madness."

Arbatov: In the discussion on the strategy of atomic war one must not use any quotations from the fifties or sixties. Many things, even the way of thinking -- in other countries -- has changed in the military field. Our armed forces are following the political leadership -- the government and the party. It is not any "specific" role of the military that matters.

However, the more the international situation is deteriorating, the faster the missiles are flying, the more rapidly decisions must be made, the less time remains left for political discussion and decision, the greater will be the threat of an accident, which may result in catastrophy.

SPIEGEL: The faster arms are built up, the greater the power of the military will be. Could we not possibly agree on the demand that a situation be prevented in which a local commander has to make a decision on the lives of 269 civilians?

Arbatov: The answer is yes, if we are agreed that mysterious actions, such as that of the Korean jet, about which the full truth is not yet know, must be stopped. We must come to learn at long last that in the atomic age international conflicts can no longer be solved in the way they were for millenia, namely by military means and through war. I believe that many ordinary people understand this much better instinctively than many politicians do.

SPIEGEL: Whom do you mean in this respect?

Arbatov: I have talked with people in West Europe who have voiced some criticism against my country but who also had come to realize that the problem of peace or war can no longer be handled as before. It is a difficult task for all -- also for us -- to understand the new realities and to act accordingly. Leonid Brezhnev was speaking about this 10 years ago, when he said that we all must come to learn to get rid of the ideas and heritage of cold war.

SPIEGEL: Is this difficult for the Soviet Union?

Arbatov: It is, above all, difficult for the Americans who had thought that this was an American century. Some of the big powers -- such as Germany and Japan -- had ceased to be mighty powers in 1945. Others, such as England and France, were weakened, and the Soviet Union had suffered much in the war. It was quite different with the United States. American industry was stronger than ever before. It was difficult for the United States to realize...

SPIEGEL: ...That things could not remain so.

Arbatov: Yes, unlike us, the Europeans, the Americans for more than two centuries have had the feeling that they were living in absolute security. The Americans believe that they were in a position to buy security, friends, trust and everything. Rethinking, what they have to do since Vietnam at the latest, is difficult for them.

SPIEGEL: Is the door still open for a dialogue between the two superpowers in the face of aggravated tension and the multitude of reciprocal insults? Is it open also for a summit meeting between the U.S. President and the CPSU General Secretary?

Arbatov: On our part the door is open, everything depends on those who are to go through it. However, if the Americans want to use this door only for the purpose of election propaganda for the next president, then we won't go along with it.

SPIEGEL: We thank you very much, Mr Arbatov, for the talk.

CORRECTION TO PRAVDA EDITORIAL ARTICLE ON START

The following correction pertains to the item entitled "U.S. Build-Down Proposals 'Mock Common Sense'" published in the 24 October Soviet Union DAILY REPORT on page AA 5, penultimate paragraph, from line five:

...As a comparison, let us recall once again that the Soviet Union is clearly proposing that equal total levels...(supplying dropped clause)

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

TASS REPORTS STATEMENT BY SOCIALIST PEACE GROUPS

LD231725 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 23 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS -- Participants in a meeting of heads of the peace committees of socialist countries demanded that the plans of nuclear rearmament in Western Europe be abandoned. The meeting ended today in Moscow.

The statement adopted by the meeting stresses that concern of the public is increasing because of the lack of progress in Geneva. Mass manifestations that were held in many European countries show that peoples demand from the U.S. Administration a constructive approach to the problems of disarmament, the document said.

Representatives of peace champions from socialist countries proclaimed their striving for a dialogue and strengthening of further cooperation with all anti-war organizations and movements in capitalist and developing countries.

The participants in the meeting expressed support for the peace course of the countries of the socialist community aimed at the curbing of the arms race and at averting nulcear war.

Those present exchanged the opinions on questions of all-round cooperation and on topical problems of the struggle for peace in connection with the worldwide campaign for disarmament proclaimed by the United Nations. They confirmed the resolve to intensify in their countries the mass movements for peace and security of peoples, above all the movements against the deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles in a number of West European countries planned by the United States and its NATO allies.

The meeting was attended by representatives of the organizations of peace supporters from Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, GDR, Kampuchea, Cuba, Laos, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, USSR and Czechoslovakia.

PRAGUE SESSION OF INTERCOSMOS NATIONS ENDS

PM251453 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In Accordance With the Intercosmos Program"]

[Text] Prague -- The annual conference of the leaders of the national coordinating organs of the countries participating in the Intercosmos program had ended in Prague. It was attended by delegations from Bulgaria, Hungary, the SRV, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romaina, the USSR, and the CSSR.

The conference participants expressed deep concern in connection with the threat of the arms race spreading to space and stressed the great importance of the initiatives of the Soviet Union and the vigorous actions of the socialist countries directed at preserving space as a zone of peace and international cooperation.

The conference summed up the results of joint research and experiments carried out in 1982-1983 in the spheres of space physics, meteorology, biology and medicine, communications, and long-range sounding of the earth.

The conference discussed long-term plans for the development of space research, more efficient cooperation in the study of space, and wider use of research results in various spheres of the national economy.

UN OFFICIALS EXPRESS VIEWS ON EVENTS IN GRENADA

LD251813 Moscow TASS in English 1756 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 25 TASS -- The United Nations secretary-general's spokesman said that Javier Perez de Cuellar was following developments in Grenada with deep concern and holding consultations with the president of the U.N. Security Council. He feared that the escalation of tension could complicate the already difficult situation in the region even further and called on all sides involved in those developments to show maximum restraint.

Jorge Illueca, president of the 38th U.N. General Assembly session, condemned the use of force. He stressed the need to launch peace efforts to resolve the problem with regard for the nations' right to self-determination and respect for their independence and territorial integrity as called for by the principles and Charter of the United Nations Organisation.

UN SECURITY COUNCIL BEGINS DISCUSSION OF GRENADA

LD260518 Moscow TASS in English 0507 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 26 TASS -- The U.N. Security Council has started the discussion of the question of the U.S. aggression against Grenada. The U.S. armed intervention is regarded here as the obvious violation of the charter of the international organization and the generally recognized norms of international law. The council is held by the request of the Government of Nicaragua. The request was also supported by the Government of Libya.

Representatives of Cuba, Guyana, Zimbabwe, the Soviet Union and other states also declared for urgent discussion of the question of the aggression against Grenada. The U.S. delegation at the United Nations made an attempt to prevent the Security Council from having its urgent meeting so as to enable the American military to complete its bandit operation without U.N. interference. But the manoeuvre was turned down by the majority of the Council members.

WPC CONDEMNS U.S. 'AGGRESSION' AGAINST GRENADA

LD252136 Moscow TASS in English 2053 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Helsinki October 25 TASS -- The World Peace Council issued today (Helsinki, October 25, 1983) the following statement on U.S. aggression against Grenada:

The peoples of the world are outraged by the open aggression of the U.S. Government against the small peace-loving and free nation of Grenada.

All who cherish peace, democracy and independence of peoples energetically condemn this brutal act by the Reagan administration against Grenada and call on all government, political parties, religious and social institutions as well as peace and anti-war movements to denounce this dangerous act perpetrated by the U.S. Marines in Latin America and the Caribbean.

There is no justification whatsoever for this brutal aggression. The internal affairs of Grenada should be solved by the Grenadians themselves. The U.S. war machinery has been set in motion to perpetuate this intervention into Grenada which is an expression of the global imperialist policy of the U.S. Government.

The bloody invasion of Grenada is not only a crime against the people of that nation but shows the threat facing peoples in Africa, Asia, Europe and elsewhere who are also confronted by this insane, abusive and aggressive policy of force of the Reagan administration.

We call upon all peace-loving forces and progressive humanity to strongly condemn this aggression which only goes to exacerbate that already critical situation in the region, putting into evidence the real intentions of U.S. Administration against the sovereignty and self-determination of peoples.

We urge all peoples to denounce this barbaric act of gunboat diplomacy and take resolute actions against the Reagan administration, the perpetrator of this crime.

Hands off Grenada!

U.S. troops out of Grenada!

We demand respect for the sovereignty and self-determination of the Grenadian people.

UN COMMITTEE DISCUSSES NONUSE OF FORCE

LD211552 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 21 Oct 83

[Text] NewYork October 21 TASS -- By TASS correspondent S. Basikov:

The overwhelming majority of U.N. member states believe that the question of banning the use of force in inter-state relations has acquired an urgent character in the present-day complicated international situation. This has been stressed by I. Garvalov (Bulgaria), chairman of the Sixth Committee (Legal) of the U.N. General Assembly, who summed up the debates at the committee. The committee completed the discussion of the issue on enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force in the international affairs.

Despite the stubborn attempts by Western powers to doubt the necessity of discussing this issue, the debates at the committee showed that the need to outlaw military force or threat of its use is becoming increasingly obvious. The world, said Nicaragua's represenative Oscar R. Tellez Arguello, is witnessing flagrant acts of violence, pressure, threats, and blackmail, and breach of elementary norms of international law on the part of the United States in various parts of the globe. When the Reagan administration came to power and started to follow a "big stick" policy in the Middle East, Africa, Central America and other regions, the threat to peace has become a reality. A virtual undeclared war is being waged against the Nicaraguan people, the Nicaraguan delegate stressed.

The Soviet Union's proposal to conclude a world treaty on non-use of force in international relations became a considerable contribution to developing the international legal guarantees of the security of the peoples, said Mongolia's representative Jargalsaikhany Enkhassaikhan [name as received]. Conclusion of this document would facilitate the assertion of a fundamental principle of the U.N. Charter in inter-state relations. The Mongolian delegate stressed the urgency of concluding a treaty between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO member states on mutual non-use of military force and on maintaining relations of peace, advanced in the political declaration of the Warasw Treaty countries.

Speeches by the representatives of the United States and its NATO bloc allies were in sharp contrast with the constructive course of the debates. The statement by American delegate R. Rosenstock, without arguments but full slander and rude attacks against the socialist countries and their peaceful line, confirmed once again that Washington is following the course of confrontation and is seeking to hamper the committee's work. However, contrary to resistance of the NATO leaders, the committee came out in favour of continuing work on drafting a world treaty on non-use of force in international relations.

HELSINKI HOSTS PREPARATIONS FOR CSCE TALKS

LD251032 Moscow TASS in English 0905 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Helsinki October 25 TASS -- A preparatory meeting for the first stage of a conference on measures to strengthen confidence and security and on disarmament in Europe opened in Finland Palace here today. The conference is to be called in Stockholm in January next year in accordance with the decisions of the Madrid meeting of representatives of states, participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The meeting in Helsinki, which is attended by delegations of 33 European countries as well as the USA and Canada, is to draw up an agenda and to discuss other arrangements for holding the first stage of the conference.

On behalf of the Government of Finland the preparatory meeting was addressed by the foreign minister of Finland, Paavo Vayrynen. After stressing the importance of a continued dialogue between states he expressed the hope that the work of the preparatory meeting in Helsinki would be effective and would contribute to the success of the conference in Stockholm.

AUCCTU SECRETARY ADDRESSES SOFIA MEETING

LD251503 Moscow TASS in English 1301 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Sofia October 25 TASS -- The official course of the United States for ensuring military supremacy and its positions of strength policy have sharply complicated the international situation and resulted in stepped up arms race. A statement to this effect was made here today at the opening session of the meeting-dialogue "Peace and Trade Unions" by Petur Dyulgerov, alternate member of the Politbureau of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee, chairman of the Central Council of Bulgarian Trade Unions. Taking part in the international meeting, which is being held on the initiative of the Central Council of Bulgarian trade unions, are representatives of more than 100 national and branch trade union centres, including an AUCCTU delegation led by AUCCTU Secretary Kazimeras Matskyavichyus.

At the present time, the speaker said, the world is threatened with a fresh escalation of the nuclear missile weapons race, a sharp growth of the threat of a military clash with unforeseen consequences. The main cause of this is NATO's decision to deploy new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. Thus, Europe is being literally turned into a nuclear proving range, and its population -- into hostages.

Practical steps are being taken to implement the military superiority strategy, Petur Dyulgerov continued. In that case counter-measures by the socialist countries will inevitably follow, and this means that the world will be drawn into a new spiral of the arms race.

The current year of 1983 may open one of the most gloomy pages in mankind's history. But it may also start another process -- that of strengthening peace, disarmament and complete denuclearisation of Europe. At the present crucial juncture put to the foreground is the problem of the prevention of the deployment of new medium-range missiles in Western Europe. There is no doubt that after the Eurorockets are installed the world will be by far closer to war.

Under these conditions, the speaker stressed, it is unthinkable to create today a united front of peace without creating above all a united workers', and consequently, united trade union front in the struggle for peace.

U.S. TECHNOLOGY EXCHANGE RESTRICTIONS CRITICIZED

PM200947 Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Oct 83 p 3

[Interview with Prof A.N. Bykov of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics of the World Socialist System Institute by special correspondent S. Richter of the GDR trade union newspaper TRIBUENE and own correspondent P. Negoitsa under the rubric "Our Interviews": "Mutual Advantage"; subhead reads: "On Technology Exchange and Its Groundless Critics"]

[Text] A.N. Bykov, doctor of economic sciences and professor of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics of the World Socialist System Institute, replies to questions from the trade union newspapers' special correspondents.

Question: In aggravating relations between states, the U.S. Administration, on the pretext of an "outflow of technology" that is dangerous for the West, is curtailing scientific and technical links with the socialist world. Moreover, it reckons that the losers will be the socialist countries, whose development -- both economic and defensive -- is virtually wholly dependent (so the United States asserts) on Western technology...

Answer: There are no grounds for such assertions. Roughly one-third of the world's scientists work in the CEMA countries. They account for nearly half of all newly registered inventions. Such is the potential of these countries. It exceeds the corresponding potential of any capitalist state or economic grouping. When effectively used, it is capable of supplying the socialist community's basic needs.

If one speaks of the "loss" that the United States promises us, then it is equally, and perhaps to an even greater extent, shared by the capitalist countries.

Question: What do you have in mind?

Answer: Above all, practical results. They testify that technology exchange between the socialist and capitalist countries is advantageous for both sides.

This, one would think, rather than any sympathy for us, is precisely the reason why even today, in a period when the international situation has been aggravated through the fault of imperialism, "many American industrialists and scientists insist on the need to maintain contacts with Soviet specialists, since they may be of use to the West." Here I am quoting the conservative American magazine U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT. According to the magazine, the USSR and its partners have in recent years sold the West licenses worth no less than $50 million. In the last decade alone U.S. companies have acquired roughly 125 licenses from the socialist countries.

Question: But perhaps, in speaking of "loss," the United States has the reverse process in mind: a restriction of exports of Western technology to the socialist countries, which, in their opinion, will cause great damage to the socialist states!

Answer: Such hopes are also unfounded. Even in the seventies, the time when East-West trade and technology exchange was to a considerable extent freed from artificial restrictions, the amount of Western technology acquired by the socialist states did not, on the whole, reach the worldwide recognized security threshold [porog bezopasnosti] although it did comprise substantial amounts in certain directions. Western technology has never determined our economic or defense potential, or the level of technological equipment in the USSR, and likewise throughout the socialist community. You only have to recall the Soviet Union's prewar experience, and its virtually independent formation as an industrially developed country.

The United States cannot fail to remember that right after the war the USSR and the other socialist countries were the target of the fiercest trade blockade, when, through the fault of the West, scientific and technological exchanges were reduced to an eloquent zero. And what happened? Even then the socialist countries did not go begging to the West, but themselves solved the most important problems of scientific and technical development in both the civilian and the military spheres. They adopted the principles of mutual scientific and technical exchange on the most favorable terms at the second CEMA session in 1949. As a result, by 1970, when this exchange became scientific and technical cooperation, the Soviet Union had given its CEMA partners around 27,000 sets of technical, project, and other documentation, receiving in its turn from them more than 15,000 sets. It was calculated that to acquire such documentation in the West the socialist countries would have had to pay no less than $20 billion. Those are the facts. And on the basis of these facts there can be no delusion about the fact that the CEMA countries created their powerful material and technical base and their defense potential on the basis of their own technology. MOreover, no restrictive steps on the part of the West could prevent this.

Question: Then let's approach the problem from a different angle, Aleksandr Naumovich. Perhaps licenses from the USSR and the other CEMA countries have no practical application in the West? Or industrialists are dissatisfied with them?

Answer: The facts show quite the reverse. Such West German firms as Thyssen-Huettewerke AG, Hoechst AG, and (Shterkrade) AG use the vapor cooling system for blast furnaces. It was introduced under a Soviet license. On the basis of this system the Japanese firm Nippon Steel achieved the world record for daily steel smelting. Many Soviet licenses are successfully used by leading firms in the United States (Kaiser Aluminum, Dupont, and Maxwell Laboratories), Britain (Rolls Royce and British Steel), and other industrially developed countries. The CEMA countries successfully sell their licenses in more than 40 foreign countries. One can cite examples of the successful application in the West of the latest technology developed jointly by the socialist countries: for instance, the equipment for producing "polymer" polyethylene developed by USSR and GDR specialists, or the equipment for producing "Malimo Befima" napped cloth -- the fruit of the labor of Polish and GDR engineers and designers.

Are the industrialists happy? On that score I think it is better to listen to the Americans themselves. "In the intensified competition that U.S. industry is now up against, the socialist countries are a potential souce of more developed and cheaper production methods," so says John (Kaizer), trade consultant to the U.S. State Department. But far from everyone in U.S. ruling circles thinks that way.

To call the mutual advantageousness of technology exchange into question and declare it to be a "one-way street" is, so to speak, a propaganda screen for U.S. strategists. They really cannot state openly that ending this exchange would be a purely political act with far-reaching goals. For that is what it really is. Even when the United States was pursuing a certain expansion of technology exchange and developing cooperative links with us it did not abandon its attempts to exploit scientific and technical ties to undermine the socialist community's unity and put pressure on our political line with a view to changing it to a direction that would be advantageous for itself. Only the methods of implementing these designs have changed. Recently, for instance, attempts have been made to give a collective basis to the increasing discriminatory steps and at the same time to profoundly differentiate them with regard to individual socialist countries on political and ther grounds. The results of Weinberger's recent visit to Beijing are the most convincing example of this.

Question: So the point here is not that technology exchange has ceased to be mutually advantageous.

Answer: Yes, it continues to be of use to all interested parties. In the age of the scientific and technological revolution surely no one can stupidly dispute the superiority of the universal division of labor and hope to painlessly exclude from it such a major region as the CEMA countries.

The socialist countries' position on this question is utterly clear: They proceed on the basis of the objective truth that scientific and technical progress is international in character, and to successfully solve the problems linked with it demands the mutually advantageous cooperation of all countries and regions. Any obstruction slows the development of world sicence and technology and affects the interests of all humanity. And it is interesting to note that there are sober-minded people in the United States who comprehend this objective demand of the time. It is not out of place here, incidentally, to note that many U.S. achievements in the sphere of science and technology were to a major extent determined by an influx of specialists from outside. It is enough to mention Einstein, Fermi, and Teller, whose contribution to creating the United States' nuclear potential is common knowledge. Today the United States has lost its scientific leadership in a number of areas. But the reason has nothing to do with an "outflow of technology," as Washington sometimes likes to explain it. The real reasons are different: They must be sought in the one-sided militarist thrust of the country's scientific and technical development and in the U.S. monopolies' short-sighted economic policy.

The U.S. Administration's present aggressiveness in questions of science and its use has another shady side, which they keep particularly quiet about on the other side of the Atlantic. In striving to tip the balance of world forces in its favor by relying ... on its technological potential, the United States counts on damaging not only the socialist countries. Intensifying its policy of technological imperialism, it is equally striving to force its competitors -- above all Japan and West Europe -- out of the market and also to hold back and put under its control the development of the new national states. In short, we can see a hegemonist policy on a global scale.

Question: With what achievements are the Soviet Union and the other CEMA countries entering the second third of the eighties?

Answer: Not so long ago the U.S. magazine FOREIGN POLICY noted that the Soviet Union is ahead of the West in many important areas, such as, for instance, welding equipment, the manufacture of synthetic diamonds, the casting of metals in an electromagnetic field, and others.

The CEMA countries have won themselves secure positions in space and nuclear research, in metallurgy and electric power, GES construction and transmitting energy over large distances, and in a number of machine-building areas. And their successes in the fundamental sciences -- above all, mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and medicine -- are universally acknowledged. We are convinced that all this is a good material basis both for accelerating scientific and technical progress in the community countries and for developing mutually advantageous technology exchange with various world states. Having set a course toward intensifying production and deepening integration process, the CEMA countries continue to favor the development of scientific and technical cooperation with the West, considering it useful and mutually advantageous. But we will never be reconciled to the White House's attempts to politicize scientific and technical links and to its persistent desire to intensify and internationalize discrimination against the socialist states on the world market. The CEMA countries counter this short-sighted policy with their own coordinated economic, scientific, and technical policy. Its goal is to turn the eighties into a period of intensive economic development for the socialist community, making wide use to this end of integrated mutual links, to strengthen its collective technical and economic independence, and to consolidate its positions in the system of the universal divisin of labor.

BRIEFS

INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT BANK MEETING -- The 35th meeting of the Council of the International Investment Bank took place in Moscow on 19 and 20 October. Taking part in it were delegations representing the bank's member countries: Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR and Czechoslovakia. Also present were representatives of the CEMA Secretariat and of the International Bank of Economic Cooperation. The Council confirmed the bank's credit plan for 1984 and the work plan and discussed other questions. The meeting passed in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship, complete mutual understanding and businesslike cooperation. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 21 Oct 83 LD]

BALTIC SEA SEMINAR -- Helsinki October 21 TASS -- A five-day international seminar of scientists and specialists from the Baltic Sea countries ended its deliberations here. Delegates from the Soviet Union, Finland, Sweden, Denmark, West Germany, the German Democratic Republic and Poland discussed the latest achievements in engineering techniques of preventing water pollution, shared information on the operations carried out by them in this field over the years that have passed since the signing of the Helsinki convention on the protection of the marine environment of the Baltic Sea zone. The delegates to the seminar unanimously stressed that the efforts of the specialists of the seven countries and close cooperation between them have produced concrete results -- the amount of pollutants in the Baltic has decreased and the water in the sea has become cleaner. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 21 Oct 83 LD]

U.S. CONGRESSMEN CRITICIZE REAGAN OVER LEBANON

LD251903 Moscow TASS in English 1843 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Washington October 25 TASS -- In a bid to justify U.S. refusal to pull out its occupation contingent from Lebanon, the U.S. President referred to the need of protecting U.S. "vital interests" in Lebanon, and ensuring its "strategic interests" in the eastern Mediterranan and the entire Middle East. Addressing provincial newspaper editors, he said that the U.S. Marines from the "multinational force" would remain there until the situation was brought under control.

By insisting that U.S. military presence in Lebanon be maintained, the President multiplied the chances for an expanded U.S. interference in that country, the ABC television company said. The NBC television company, in its turn stresses, commenting on the urgent Western European tour of the U.S. secretary of state on instructions of the President, that his chief aim will be to press Western European countries into consenting to increase the number of their troops making up the "multinational force" together with the U.S. contingent.

According to a recent Gallup poll, a majority of Americans (48 vs. 21 per cent) favor an undelayed withdrawal of U.S. troops from Lebanon. NBC reports that an opinion poll conducted by the White House staff also registered a dramatically increased concern of the Americans over U.S. involvement in Lebanon.

The U.S. Congress is also showing signs of profound concerning. According to ABC, U.S. Secretary of State Shultz was showered with criticism when he tried to explain in the Congress the policy of the administration in Lebanon. A number of congressmen told him bluntly that the U.S. policy in Lebanon is deeply erroneous, a correspondent for this television company said. NBC points out that Congressman Clarence Long submitted a resolution prohibiting the allocation of funds for the up-keep of U.S. Marines in Lebanon. Congressman Lane Evans announced his intention to submit a resolution demanding an immediate withdrawal of U.S. Marines from Lebanon. Representative Sam Gibbons said that Lebanon was Reagan's Vietnam.

Other legislators and prominent public and political figures of the country, including Senators Charles Mathias, Gary Hart, Alan Cranston, John Glenn, Paul Sarbanes, Sam Nunn, Ernest Hollings, Patrick Leahy, Representatives Ted Weiss, Thomas Downey, and former U.S. Vice President Walter Mondale, bitterly criticised the U.S. Administration. Writing in THE NEW YORK TIMES, former U.S. Under-Secretary of State George Ball said that he was scared by the recklessness of the Reagan administration which ignored the lessons of the past few days in Lebanon.

Observers condemn the efforts of the U.S. Administration to distract public attention from its territorial claims in Lebanon by making a production of the grossly over-used myth about the "Soviet threat". No one is any longer surprised by the desire of the U.S. President to play up the incident in Lebanon to a scale of confrontation between the USSR and the USA, NBC notes. Each time the President wants to justify one or other military or diplomatic move he immediately presents it within the framework of East-West confrontation. Observers regard insinuations and threats of President Reagan and Secretary of State Shultz against other countries of the region, specifically Syria and Iran, as a sure sign of the desire to scale up U.S. military intervention in the region.

U.S. ARMY 'SABOTEURS' UNITS STEPPING UP TRAINING

PM210854 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Oct 83 Second Edition p 5

[Colonel G. Arzumanov "Notes Apropos": "Fort Bragg Honors Saboteurs"]

[Text] Unusual animation prevails in these October days at the American military post of Fort Bragg. The units here which are chiefly destined for ideological and other sabotage work, secret psychological warfare operations, and subversive activity, are in the grip of a special commotion. High-ranking visitors are expected at the J. Kennedy school, where U.S. Army intelligence operatives are trained for foreign states, and also at the 96th independent military administration battalion, destined to establish "American order" in those territories which U.S. troops plan to occupy.

Preparations for a ceremonial march are being made by U.S. Special Forces and two battalions of the so-called "Rangers" -- cutthroats who, according to the American ARMY TIMES, are destined for sabotage actions in the rear of the Warsaw Pact countries' troops and for operations "in those countries where the Soviets are having success -- in Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia." The holiday enthusiasm has also seized the 4th U.S. Army Psychological Operations Group, whose task is reputed to be the ideological and psychological disarming of enemy troops and population.

The excitement which has seized this "hornets' nest" and which is not normally typical of the saboteurs being trained there has been caused by the large-scale celebrations on the first anniversary of the formation from the aforementioned units of the American Special Operations Command, but chiefly in connection with the conferring of new insignia on the American sabotage activity specialists. Henceforth the Special Operations Command staff officers (around 300 men) will wear on their uniform an emblem depicting the Trojan horse -- a generally accepted symbol of perfidy and fraudulent actions -- with the inscription "Without Equal." Some 1,100 other highly skilled saboteurs from among the sergeants will have sewn onto their sleeves a badge depicting a chess knight to symbolize their ability to deal blows unexpectedly, on the quiet, behind the back.

One might think that all this, including the shameless political striptease when treachery is openly and cynically raised to a pedestal of virtue, could be considered an internal matter for the U.S. Army. If the baseness and treachery which according to legend accompanied the fall of Troy impress American generals and officers, that is ultimately their own affair. And it may even very possibly be that here, as the new emblem alleges, the U.S. commander has no equal among saboteurs. But the game being played at Fort Bragg is merely the external background for the Pentagon's operations, the real significance of which goes far beyond the bounds of an American barracks.

According to independent information which has been leaked to the press, over 10 report specialties have been established for U.S. military saboteurs this year, according to which the whole host of saboteurs will be reclassified by September 1984. In fiscal 1984 the Special Forces staffs will be expanded by 15 percent and around 1,500 extra privates will be accepted. There will be vacancies for 600 officers and 227 noncommissioned officers. Training for airdrops of saboteurs is being stepped up. It is planned to create a new special saboteurs' group for operations in areas of Asia. It is planned to deploy one battalion of this group in Okinawa, while its headquarters are at the Fort Louis military post (United States).

There are plans to step up the dispatch abroad of saboteurs' groups to study the areas of their possible combat use. In this connection it is also reported that over the last few years, 300 saboteurs have already undergone a "training period" in some 52 countries of the world.

The stepping up of U.S. Army training for sabotage operations, carried out within the framework of the aggressive course of the current U.S. Administration's policy, cannot and should not go unnoticed. It requires enhanced vigilance from Soviet servicemen.

MOSCOW: U.S. SPACE WEAPONS TO COVER FIRST ATTACK

LD242025 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 24 Oct 83

[Text] The United States intends to spend between $18 and 27 billion on creating what is described as the first layer of space-based weapons. A highly classified report to this effect has been approved by Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and submitted to President Reagan. Our observer Igor Dmitriyev makes this comment. Here is what he writes:

People are told that space weapons are good because they don't kill anybody. They are meant to destroy the bad or offensive weapons, missiles, and bombers. This aspect of security which space weapons would supposedly provide was very much exploded by President Reagan last March when he announced plans to build such a system. According to experts, the first generation of space and ground-based laser, particle-beam, and high-power microwave weapons is likely to appear in the late nineties or at the turn of the century. Other experts are more optimistic. They say that testing could begin in the late eighties. In fact, the Pentagon has announced that an orbital demonstration of space weapons would be held in 1987.

Will these good weapons replace the bad ones? Not at all. The D-5 or Trident II missile that can carry up to 14 warheads is not yet in production. It's due to begin soon. The missile will replace the Trident I and won't be easily scrapped after so much money was spent on it. Will there be no such bad weapons as strategic bombers? The B-1 and Stealth bombers are being developed and built because of their potential ability to penetrate Soviet air defenses well into the beginning of the next century. And the U.S. Air Force has already ordered 1,000 single-warhead Midgetman missiles that are expected to become the backbone of the American strategic arsenal in the 1990's.

To sum it all up, not a single U.S. official says that strategic weapons are doomed and face oblivion once the so-called defensive space-based arms are built and deployed. And this means that weapons in space are meant to provide a cover for a first nuclear attack. There can be no such thing as there being only defensive weapons. Why should they exist at all in the absence of offensive ones? The only thing that does make sense is a combination of both, that is a capability to attack and at the same time a protection against retaliation. This being the case, the development and construction of space weapons opens a very dangerous channel of the arms race.

How do plans to build space weapons square with the President's claims that the United States has been doing nothing in the past decade or so in the military field? No weapons, be it a machinegun, tank, or laser, can be built without some prior research and development. In other words, before President Reagan publicly announced plans for an antimissile defense system many millions of dollars must have been spent on research and development over a long period of time. And finally, the President's plans are in conflict with the 1972 Soviet-American ABM treaty, which barred the development, use, and deployment of antiballistic missiles weapons on land, sea, air, and space.

According to White House spokesman Larry Speakes you can go a considerable distance in research and development without conflicting with the ABM treaty. The truth is that the United States has already gone that distance. About a month ago THE NEW YORK TIMES for the first time reported that the Pentagon was about to test an antisatellite system involving an F-15 fighter armed with a missile to knock out satellites. The testing has been called off several times, which does not mean that there is no such program. With the Reagan administration anything goes. It has completely revised the principles that governed the Soviet-American arms control talks over the past 10 years and put forward proposals that seek to adjust arms control and reduction to new weapon systems. Like in the past, United States officials claim that new American weapons can convince this nation to agree to American terms.

Assessing the policies of the Reagan administration the Soviet leader, Yuriy Andropov, said in his statement in September that they are militaristic and that the administration is planning to extend the unrestrained arms race into space.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY SINCE DIMITROV TRIAL ASSESSED

LD221105 Moscow TASS in English 0900 GMT 22 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS -- "Analysis of the foreign policy of the present American Administration attests to a considerable change in U.S. official policy to the right, towards extreme irresponsibility and direct adventurism," KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes today in an article devoted to the 50th anniversary of the Leipzig trial of Georgi Dimitrov.

"In recent years, the actions by world imperialism, Zionism and reaction led by the United States resemble to a large measure the actions of German Nazis, Italian fascists and Japanese militarists in the thirties -- on the eve of their military adventures," the article says. "Events of fifty years ago are a characteristic example -- the provocative Reichstag fire, staged by fascists, and the just as provocative trial in Leipzig which followed. At that time, as today, the provocateurs had one aim: to escalate the threat of war, kindle anti-communist hysteria and undermine the policy of peace and cooperation among peoples."

"We assess today the lessons of the Leipzig trial as an integral part of the universal struggle against fascism, neofascism and imperialist reaction," KRASNAYA ZVEZDA stresses.

"Provocations, terror and mass killings still remain among the favourite techniques used by imperialist adventurists of all sorts. The ruling leadership in the United States needs such an atmosphere in order to justify the unrestricted arms race and implement such peace-endangering intentions as the deployment of nearly 600 modern nuclear missiles in Western Europe, and to carry out military provocations in countries of Central America, Africa and the Middle East. Such a situation makes it impossible to justify provocations, like the incident involving a South Korean plane, and then, in an atmosphere of anti-Soviet hysteria, to escalate war preparations. The imperialists use for that any, big and small, pretext -- from accusing Bulgarian citizen Antonov of making an attempt on the life of the pope, carried out by Turkish neofascist Agca allegedly in 'Moscow's interests,' to Washington's participation in dozens of military adventures, including the 'undeclared war' against Afghanistan."

IZVESTIYA CALLS FOR END TO DPRK 'SLANDER CAMPAIGN'

FM251445 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 4

[V. Ganshin commentary under the rubric "Notes Apropos": "End the Provocations"]

[Text] The situation on the Korean peninsula has again sharply deteriorated. Using as an excuse the incident in Rangoon where an explosion at the Aung San mausoleum killed four ministers of Chon Tu-hwan's cabinet, the Seoul authorities are launching another extensive propaganda campaign against the DPRK. Ridiculous accusations are being made alleging DPRK "involvement" in the events in the Burmese capital. The remains of the victims of the explosion were still awaiting interment when the South Korean dictator hastily placed the country on increased combat alert.

The Burmese authorities have not yet announced the findings of the inquiry into the incident in Rangoon, but Seoul, with the tacit approval of its "senior partner," Washington, is already hollering fit to bust about "the North's provocations." It is the South Korean rulers' usual approach to look for a nonexistent danger. As the Japanese paper SANKEI SHIMBUN noted in this connection, "The purpose of the reaction of Chon Tu-hwan, who immediately associated the North with the act of terrorism, is to use the incident as a shield to ward off unrest in South Korea."

And Seoul has any number of reasons for anxiety. The persecution of democratic figures and trade union activists and the detainment of all those who try to oppose the puppet regime are a long-standing practice in the country. The jails are crammed with opposition-minded elements, but the secret police and security services are still working nonstop. They are displaying particular zeal in connection with the fact that many people participating in antigovernment actions are producing anti-American slogans. They are protesting against the conversion of the country into a bridgehead for aggressive U.S. policy in the Far East and against South Korea's behavior in obediently accommodating Washington's adventurist plans.

Maybe one should add a few words to the Japanese paper's pronouncement. Seoul's reaction to the events in Burma is not only a "shield" but also a sword, unsheathed and pointing at the northern part of the Korean peninsula. Past weeks have seen a whole series of crude provocations against the DPRK involving the South Korean and U.S. military. There have been large-scale military maneuvers, and U.S. reconnaissance aircraft have continued to make provocative incursions into DPRK airspace. According to reports in Pyongyang's NODONG SINMUN, the situation is deteriorating in the demilitarized zone where DPRK posts have come in for repeated armed raids and shelling from the South Korean side.

The provocative ballyhoo unleashed by the Seoul authorities and plainly inspired by Washington is a menace to peace and security on the peninsula and in the Far East in general. In the interests of the entire Korean people this sordid slander campaign must be stopped.

FOJTIK-LED CPCZ DELEGATION VISITS MOSCOW

PM251051 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Experience"]

[Text] A CPCZ delegation led by J. Fojtik, candidate member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, was in the Soviet Union 16-22 October. J. Havlin, CPCZ Central Committee secretary, and other Czechoslovak comrades were part of the delegation.

The delegation familiarized itself with the experience of ideological activity by the CPSU and central, republic, and oblast ideological institutions in fulfilling the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums. An exchange of experience took place on topical questions of political education and propaganda work and the further improvement of ideological cooperation between the two parties.

The Czechoslovak comrades had meetings and discussions at the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda, Science and Educational Institutions, Culture, and International Information Departments and acquainted themselves with the organization of theoretical work at the CPSU Central Committee Marxism-Leninism Institute, the practice of training ideology cadres in the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, and the mass political and organizational work of the Moscow CPSU Obkom and Gorkom House of Political Education.

The delegation went to Kiev and Leningrad where they had meetings and discussions at the Ukrianian Communist Party Central Committee and Leningrad CPSU Obkom, visited a number of party committees and primary party organizations of industrial and scientific research institutes, and met with an ideological workers' aktiv.

The CPCZ delegation was received at the CPSU Central Committee by K.U. Chernenko, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and M.V. Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

C. Lovetinsky, Czechoslovak ambassador to the USSR, took part in the discussions, which were held in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship and cordiality.

RESISTANCE IN FRG TO 'U.S. SINISTER PLANS'

LD252358 Moscow TASS in English 1929 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Robert Serebrennikov writes:

Western Europe and the United States, Canada and Japan are seething with anti-war and anti-missile manifestations without precedent from the point of view of magnitude and combativeness. The large-scale ouslaught of the peoples on the adventuristic course of the United States and NATO, bent on deploying new U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles in Western Europe, thus posing a threat to the whole world, is gaining momentum.

Major anti-war demonstrations took place during the weekend in West Germany, the country cast out by the Washington strategists in the role of the Pentagon's nuclear testing range. Representatives of all the strata of the West German population are resisting the U.S. sinister plans. The press has said, for instance, that a total of about 2.5 million people took part in the activities of week of action against the deployment of the U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles that ended in West Germany. Almost 1.3 million peace campaigners participated in protests last Saturday alone.

This referendum against nuclear madness, in which whole nations have now spoken up, forcefully shows that the overwhelming majority of the West Europeans are resolutely rejecting NATO's "nuclear rearmament," dangerous to the cause of peace, and opposing the stockpiling of nuclear weapons in the European Continent.

But how do the NATO leading circles respond to the strong and authoritative voice of the peoples?

Spokesman for the Brussels headquarters of the North Atlantic alliance, which jointly with the Pentagon is finalizing preparations for the deployment of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles, have said that the NATO policy has not changed in the least. While this absolutely negative reply is fully in accord with the flagrantly militaristic stand of the NATO top brass, who are deliberately whipping up the nuclear arms race, a more balanced and responsible approach to the opinion of their own peoples could be expected from the governments of the countries chosen by Washington to host the "death missiles."

That is why Bonn's official position looks at least strange. Addressing a meeting of the board of the CDU Party, Chancellor Kohl has stated that the West German Government intends to comply with NATO's nuclear-missile plans despite all the actions of protest.

Moreover, as the unprecedented anti-war demonstrations went on in the streets of West German cities, Defence Minister Woerner of the FRG decided it was the right time to deliver the governmental report to the Bundestag commission on defence, in which he advocated "NATO's ability for nuclear escalation" and "the capability for being the first to use nuclear weapons."

Growing ever more aware of the threat of nuclear catastrophe, the peoples of Europe and the world at large are pooling their efforts to save life and human civilisation. Their large-scale anti-war protests doom to moral isolation the proponents of the escalation of the arms race and the most "hawkish" militarist forces.

The will of the peoples against U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe is clear and unambiguous, and those who disregard the will of the overwhelming majority of the West Europeans are incurring grave responsibility.

FRENCH RDF DESIGNED FOR ANTI-SOVIET OPERATIONS

LD250957 Moscow TASS in English 0804 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Paris October 25 TASS -- One of the main objectives of the so-called Rapid Deployment Force recently created in France is to carry out, jointly with the other NATO troops, operations against the Soviet Armed Forces. A statement to this effect was made with the straitforwardness of a soldier by General Rene Imbot, chief of staff of the French land forces. His article on this subject, published in the NATO'S SIXTEEN NATIONS journal, which is close to the NATO circles in Brussels, has attracted close attention of political observers in Paris. It is pointed out that until recently French military leaders described the role and task of this force in vague terms.

The article says that in central Europe the Rapid Deployment Force will give the French Government an opportunity to carry out military interference far outside the national borders. It is specified that they will strike chiefly against Soviet armoured troops, by closely cooperating with the NATO allies.

General Imbot, the newspaper LE MONDE points out, is "the most official representative of the military hierarchy." His statements, the newspaper stresses, are most convincing evidence that "already now the French Army is engaged in preparations, is assuming an appropriate structure and being equipped in such a way that, if need be, it will be capable to fight together with the allies against the Soviet Army."

BRITISH WEEKLY CITED ON EXPANSION OF U.S. BASES

LD251056 Moscow TASS in English 0919 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] London October 25 TASS -- The NEW STATESMAN weekly points out, referring to the U.S. draft budget for the 1984 fiscal year for military construction, that the Pentagon intends to equip in Britain a third base for the logistic support of cruise missiles in Alconbury (Cambridegshire County). According to the NATO plans, cruise missiles were earlier to be deployed in the U.S. bases in Greenham Common (Berkshire County) and Malsworth (Cambridgeshire County).

Simultaneously the USA in planning, according to the weekly, to expand considerably its base of nuclear-powered submarines in Holy Loch bay in Scotland. The Pentagon's new projects concerning the American "Poseidon" submarines are evidence that, contrary to the previous opinion that the USA would give up the Holy Loch base after the new British submarines with "Trident" nuclear missiles are put into service, Washington will preserve its military presence in the base in the future too, the NEW STATESMAN points out. The weekly goes on to say that the berths for the submarines in the base will be extended, new depots for equipment will be built. With that aim in view it is planned to appropriate ten million pounds sterling.

Apart from that, the USA is already building or planning to build new hospitals, that will function only in war time. To this end the Pentagon demands the appropriation of 300 million pounds sterling. These hospitals, the weekly says, are necessary for the USA, as the Pentagon's strategists envisage at the present time the possibility of a prolonged war in Europe, which will speedily fill the American military medical institutions existing in Britain.

Simultaneously a system of reconnaissance installations of the USA in Britain is being widened and new spy air force elements are being formed. According to the NEW STATESMAN, a squadron of American "TP-1" spy planes is being formed in the Alconbury base. The first out of the 1,300 American servicemen started arriving at the base for the service and operation of these aircraft.

Preparations are under way in Upper Heyford base for the reception of the 42nd Electronic Combat Squadron of 12 "EF-111" aircraft. The aircraft carrying powerful radio-jamming equipment, the weekly says, are designed to create distortions and bloc the operation of air defence radars of the East European countries during attacks with nuclear or conventional weapons, and facilitate the actions of U.S. "F-111" fighter bombers.

After the implementation of the Pentagon's plans, the weekly points out, the number of U.S. military bases in Britain will increase from 101 at the present time to reach 160 in 1988.

Noteworthy above all is the fact that in the military construction being planned or already carried out, Washington lays its main emphasis on preparations for waging a long war in the European Continent.

RYZHOV MEETS ITALIAN FOREIGN MINISTRY OFFICIAL

LD251328 Moscow TASS in English 1032 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS -- The Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Nikita Ryzhov received today F. Corrias, head of the African Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy, who had arrived in Moscow to hold Soviet-Italian consultations on a number of African problems.

The talk was attended by the ambassador of Italy to the USSR, Giovanni Migliuolo.

USSR'S VIENNA ENVOY RECEIVES PEACE MARCHERS

AU251530 Vienna ARBEITER ZEITUNG in German 25 Oct 83 p 2

[Text] Vienna (AZ) -- On Saturday [22 October], contrary to other reports, partcipants in the human peace chain [from the U.S. Embassy to the Soviet Embassy in Vienna] were admitted to meet with Soviet Ambassador Yefremov for a 45-minute talk during which they expressed their regrets for the lack of freedom of action of the peace movement in the East.

U.S. POLICY ON LEBANON, STATEMENTS SCORED

U.S. To Continue 'Occupation'

PM251139 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 83 First Edition p 5

[Article by Pavel Demchenko under the rubric "Commentator's Column": "Result of Policy of Adventures"]

[Text] Two powerful explosions occurred in Beirut Sunday morning. One of them reduced to rubble the main headquarters of the U.S. contingent belonging to the so-called "multinational forces." The second destroyed the French headquarters. According to the latest reports the death toll is 161 U.S. soldiers and officers and 31 Frenchmen. In Washington U.S. President R. Reagan has convened two extraordinary meetings of the National Security Council, while French President F. Mitterrand has made a surprise visit to Beirut.

Western news agencies and newspapers are full of reports of the event. That is understandable, if you consider the nature of the occurrence. However, it is something else which draws the attention and puts us on our guard. Although it is still not clear who organized the explosions, some Western propaganda organs are placing responsibility for them on some "Islamic terrorists" allegedly connected with Iran. Others, in the quest for some external enemies, are naming Syria.

But there are also those who are not averse to exploiting the incident in order to spur the anti-Soviet campaign unleashed by Washington. U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger has been in the vanguard of the anti-Soviets, as has frequently been the case in the past. Speaking on a CBS television program, he unhesitatingly relaunched slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union. His statement is so cynical and slanderous that it need not be refuted, showing yet again the state of anti-Soviet paranoia afflicting one of the leaders of the U.S. Administration.

After the National Security Council session a White House spokesman said that the United States' retaliatory actions "will be resolute and will accord with its previously stated policy and goals." These words alone already give grounds for concluding that Washington is counting on continuing and reinforcing its occupation of part of Lebanese territory and its same expansionist course in the Near East as a whole. The mention of Iran is no accident, when major naval formations are now massing off its shores. The mention of Syria, which stands in the way of U.S.-Israeli plans in the region and against which a large-scale act of military provocation has long been in preparation, is no accident either.

However, it should be clear to any unbiased person that the events in Beirut are the direct result of the adventurist policy pursued by Washington, which is sending in its armed forces wherever developments are not following the U.S. scenario. The Lebanese patriots view the U.S. soldiers as occupiers, just like the Israelis, and are fighting for their withdrawal from Lebanese soil.

Senator G. McGovern called the dispatch of the Marines to Lebanon an act of veritable political madness. And indeed, the interests of peace are served not by the exploitation of the explosions as a pretext for even greater U.S. interference in Near East affairs but by the sober conclusion that only the withdrawal of the U.S. forces would help the resolution of the region's acute problems at the conference table with the participation of all interested sides.

'Absurd Anti-Soviet Lie'

LD260054 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS -- Commentator Vladimir Kudelin writes:

The U.S. Administration used the Beirut explosions which wrecked the headquarters of the U.S. contingent of the "multinational force" as a pretext for building up U.S. military presence in Lebanon and the whole of the Middle East.

Addressing provincial journalists in Washington yesterday, President Reagan tried in every way to justify the further presence of U.S. Marines on Lebanese soil and said for the umpteenth time that the USA allegedly had "vital interests in Lebanon". He, however, preferred to remain silent on the fact that Washington's direct intervention in Lebanon had led to numerous casualties among the civilian population of the long-suffering Arab country, and had made the solution of the Lebanese problem even more difficult.

It seems appropriate to recall that the U.S. military presence, which has a sharply adverse effect on the situation in Lebanon, continues. Moreover, it is expanding, despite President Reagan's own pledges. For only one year back, giving a go-ahead for U.S. Marines to land in Lebanon, the U.S. President maintained that the Marines would stay there for hardly more than one month.

More than one year has passed since then, but U.S. soldiers are still trampling upon the Lebanese soil, defending the "vital interests" of the USA many thousands of kilometers away from their own home. However, the case in point is not only a flagrant violation of the sovereign rights of the Lebanese people by Washington. No, the case in point is the U.S. striving for military and political domination of the peoples of the entire Arab east, for turning that area into a U.S. fief. That is why the recent decision of the U.S. Congress to extend by another 1.5 years the term of the stay of U.S. Marines in Lebanon (with reinforcements and additional equipment pouring into Lebanon right now) cause well-grounded fears in other countries of the region as well.

Making futile efforts to justify the adventurist policy of the White House in the Middle East, high-ranking administration officials, specifically, U.S. Secretary of State Shultz and Defense Secretary Weinberger, are piling one absurd anti-Soviet lie upon another, vainly trying to convince the world public that a "Soviet threat" is allegedly looming dark over the region.

There is hardly any need to prove that these ill-intentioned lies are utterly absurd. Over many years all Arab countries could see for themselves that the Soviet Union pursues a consistent policy in the Middle East aimed at bringing about a just and durable peace in the region, ousting Israeli occupation troops from the seized Arab territories and ensuring the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

As to the culprits of the tragedy of Lebanon and tensions in other countries of the region, they are well known. They are the Israeli aggressor and its patron in the person of the United States, which is pursuing its self-serving interests there -- interests alien and hostile to the aspirations of the Arabs.

Comparison With Vietnam

LD260048 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] A spokesman for the White House has said U.S. actions in Lebanon will be resolute and befitting the earlier proclaimed objectives. Now a commentary from Valentin Lapin of our staff:

The statement came after President Reagan's emergency meeting with senior Pentagon officials in connection with the blasts in Beirut. The explosions hit the headquarters of American and French contingents of so-called international force. More than 200 men died, died as it turns out for the so-called earlier proclaimed objectives.

Now what are these objectives? If you recall last autumn when President Reagan dispatched American Marines to Lebanon he pledged solemnly that they will stay there 1 month, no longer. But they are still in action, and their strength is increased. It was alleged that the marines would fulfill, along with troops of other NATO countries, an exclusively peaceful mission: to guarantee the security of Lebanese and Palestinian refugees and to contribute to the restoration of Lebanon's sovereignty.

At the first stages someone in Lebanon believed that the United States would help clearing the country's south of Israeli troops, but instead the agreement with Tel Aviv was imposed on Lebanon -- the agreement that crudely tramples upon Lebanon's sovereignty. Israel continues to occupy nearly one third of that country. At the same time, American troops themselves began military actions as they subjected to shelling Beirut areas and Lebanese mountain villages. By fire from naval artillery guns Lebanese are being forced to accept both Israeli occupation and American military presence becoming occupation too. Thus, what Washington proclaimed to be an interim peace mission in Lebanon is developing into an all-out intervention and this trend is mounting.

Quite indicatively, talking of Lebanon reminds us of Vietnam. There too everything started with the dispatch of so-called missionaries in military uniforms and developed into protracted bloody aggression. Now Washington is searching for those guilty for the death of its soldiers in Beirut, accusing all and everyone, even the Soviet Union, which, as the U.S. defense secretary, Weinberger, has alleged, interferes in the Middle East countries' affairs. But these allegations are being ridiculed even in the American press. It is Washington that has been wrecking a comprehensive Middle East settlement. It was Washington that encouraged Israel for aggression in Lebanon, aggression that victimized or left homeless scores of thousand of Lebanese, aggression that turned into genocide against Palestinians. That's forgotten in Washington and no wonder, for it was thanks to Israeli aggression that Washington gained a foothold first in the Sinai and now in Lebanon, just in line with its policy of capturing and submitting the lands arbitrarily included in the zone of so-called vital U.S. interests.

The statement by the White House spokesman about resolute U.S. actions in Lebanon sounds as an open threat to escalate American intervention, and this threatens to make the situation even more dangerous in Lebanon and in the Middle East as a whole.

U.S. 'Interference' Blamed

LD260548 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Vladislav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] Now, comments by Vladislav Kozyakov on the death of over 250 American and French soldiers in Lebanon.

The United States Marines suffered the greatest losses in Beirut on Sunday. It was the largest number of casualties among United States soldiers since the war in Vietnam. The problem of course was not that the positions of American troops by the Beirut Airport were not sufficiently fortified, as some leaders in Washington claim. The problem is that in Lebanon, as in Vietnam, the United States is trying to interfere in the affairs of another nation.

It is meaningless that the United States interference is under the guise of multinational peacekeeping forces. The United States Armed Forces came to Lebanon right after Israel intervention, and so it's not surprising that Lebanese patriots look on the Americans as occupation troops. And it's no accident that since the United States Marines have come to Lebanon, casualties have been increasingly on the rise. Since Mr Reagan sent American troops to Lebanon, many news analysts and members of Congress have warned of the great danger this action poses to the United States. Reagan's critics warn that, because of the critical political situation in the country, which was further aggravated by Israeli armed intervention, the United States could easily be involved in military action that would be difficult to get out of.

However, the White House ignores these forecasts. Furthermore, the administration has essentially escalated its military interference. With each new loss among the marines, United States Armed Forces became increasingly involved in military actions in Lebanon. Until Sunday, 7 were killed, and 16 wounded [words indistinct] have been fired on by American warships, helicopters and by the marines themselves. For all practical purposes, the Pentagon has become a belligerent party in Lebanon. That's the background of the events that took place in Beirut last Sunday, when nearly 200 American soldiers died. Even before the details of the incident are released, and before we know exactly who planned it, we can say for certain that the Americans who died were the victims of Reagan's adventurist policies. As was the case during the war in Vietnam, the current United States President is sending Americans to their deaths, thousands of miles away from the United States, because of ambitious plans to dictate to other peoples and countries.

Now, after the Sunday events in Beirut, many members of Congress and [words indistinct] are once again appealing to the White House to rectify the mistake and call the Armed Forces home from Lebanon. But where's the response from Reagan, Shultz and Weinberger? In order to evade responsibility for sending the Marines into Beirut, which led to death and injuries of over 200 American soldiers, they are trying to hide behind anti-Soviet, anti-Syrian [words indistinct].

SYRIA DENIES INVOLVEMENT IN BEIRUT BLASTS

LD260015 Moscow TASS in English 1443 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Paris October 25 TASS -- The ambassador of Syria to France made a television appearance here. He strongly denied reports of Syria's involvement in the Beirut explosions -- reports circulated by Washington and its yes-men in Western Europe. "Those who are striving for the escalation of the conflict in Lebanon and undermining efforts to attain national reconciliation in that country stand behind the explosions," he said.

MINISTERS OF MULTINATIONAL FORCE COUNTRIES TO MEET

LD252023 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] According to an announcement in Rome, a meeting will open there on Saturday of the foreign ministers of the United States, Britain, France, and Italy -- that is, countries which have contingents in the so-called multinational force in Lebanon. The meeting, sponsored by Washington, is aimed at expanding interference in Lebanon. To achieve this, the U.S. Administration is using the situation that has arisen following the explosions in Beirut which led to considerable casualties among U.S. and French servicemen. According to news agencies, President Reagan has threatened to retaliate the blast. He also said that the American troops will stay on in Lebanon and that their number will be probably increased.

In Moscow, the national daily PRAVDA has discharged as cynical the attempts by Washington to put the blame for the situation in Lebanon on the Soviet Union and stressed that the events in Beirut are the direct result of the U.S. adventurous policy.

RYABOV, DELEGATION RETURN FROM TUNISIA

LD260619 Moscow International Service in French 2000 GMT 24 Oct 83

[Excerpts] The Soviet delegation led by Yakov Ryabov, chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, is back from Tunisia.

The Soviet and Tunisian delegations signed a new agreement following talks on the development of economic and technical cooperation in the construction of hydro-technical projects which provides for Soviet technical aid for the establishment of the Sidi al-Barak complex and for three dams on the Tin, Douimis, and Melah rivers.

Soviet organizations will be responsible for study and prospecting work, and the supply of necessary equipment and specialists. They will also contribute to training national cadres for building and running these projects.

MOSCOW HIGHLIGHTS COOPERATION WITH LIBYA

LD260639 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] The Soviet Union and the Libyan Jamahiriyah have confirmed their determination to develop fruitful cooperation in all fields of the economy, science, and technology. This is according to the protocol signed by both sides at the end of the recent ninth session of the Soviet-Libyan governmental committee on economic, scientific, technological, and commercial cooperation which has held in Tripoli. This cooperation has been developing successfully over 10 years and it is based on the firm principles of complete equality and mutual benefit. Its objective is to assist in the creation of a modern and independent economy and the achievement of social progress in the Libyan Jamahiriyah.

The USSR assists the Libyan Jamahiriyah in the establishment of a national power generation industry, and with the participation of Soviet specialists an electricity grid is being built. And Soviet drilling equipment works successfully in desert conditions. Work is about to be completed on the gas line from Al-Buraythah to Misurata, where an iron and steel complex is to be built with Soviet assistance as well. Furthermore much experience has been gained in agriculture. In 1981, Soviet experts completed researching and preparing a soil map for an area of nearly 3.5 million hectares. Soviet establishments received an invitation to take part in the implementation of the plan to divert subterranean water from the inner regions to the barren regions, something which will allow farmers to almost double the production of cereals.

PDRY LEADER RESPONDS TO GREETINGS MESSAGE

PM250926 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 83 First Edition p 1

[Text] To Comrade Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

We report with great pleasure the receipt of the greetings message from the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers on the 20th anniversary of the 14 October revolution.

On behalf of the Yemeni Socialist Party Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme People's Council, and the Council of Ministers of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, we express thanks and gratitude for your sincere sense of internationalism, and also for the support of the revolutionary experience being put into practice in democratic Yemen, which are expressed in the greetings message. We would like to express our best wishes for your health and happiness. You may be sure that the relations of friendship and cooperation between our countries will invariably strengthen for the sake of our states and peoples and in the interests of peace and the peoples' struggle against international imperialism.

'Ali Nasir Muhammad

NEW SOVIET AMBASSADOR TO SUDAN NAMED

PM251239 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 83 First Edition p 6

[Unattributed "News Item"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Yevgeniy Vasilyevich Musiyko USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Democratic Republic of Sudan.

EGYPT REMAINS 'PRISONER OF CAMP DAVID'

PM201020 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Kapralov commentary: "Tightly Gripped in the Vise of the Camp David Deal"]

[Text] In the Egyptian skies the "Bright Star" -- code name for the U.S. "Rapid Deployment Force" (RDF for short) maneuvers which have taken place here -- has hardly had time to fade, when Egypt is again being turned into a test drive for the NATO countries' military preparations in the Near East. On this occasion it is British troops which will rehearse interference in the Near East region's affairs on Egyptian territory. London is playing an increasingly active part in fueling tension in this explosive area.

During Britain's colonial war in the Falklands the United States did all it could to support Britain and actively helped to set up the British "fortress Falklands." Now London is repaying the service -- it is helping the marines, the advance detachment of the U.S. RDF, to dig in on the Lebanese bridgehead. (Let me also recall that British troops form part of the so-called "multinational force" deployed on the Sinai peninsula.) During the sharp exacerbation of events in Lebanon and the stepped up interventionist actions by the U.S. troops in that country, Britain actively intervened in the conflict. British Buccanneer assault aircraft crisscrossed Lebanese skies alongside U.S. Phantoms. In Lebanon and on its shores the great-power imperial arrogance which has built up in London since the times when London lost its former positions "east of Suez" has found an outlet. And therefore it is no accident that west of Suez, on Egyptian territory, British forces are organizing provocative maneuvers hard on the heels of the U.S. RDF.

Washington is trying to get Egypt to act as an accomplice of the United States and its North Atlantic bloc allies in the post-Sadat era, too. It would suit the White House if Cairo continued to steer a pro-American course, and this was borne out in particular by the recent visit to Washington by Egyptian President H. Mubarak and his talks with U.S. President R. Reagan.

On the eve of the third summit between Mubarak and Reagan the Egyptian newspaper AL-AHRAM wrote that the Egyptian delegation would demand (!) from the United States that it publicly denounce Israel for its colonization of Arab lands and bring pressure to bear on Israel to make it stop its aggression in Lebanon. By using the word "demand" the Egyptian newspaper tried to emphasize that equality prevails in what Mubarak described as the "fraternal" ties between Washington and Cairo. However, demanding something from Washington, which is used to dictating its own conditions, is not easy.

The notorious As-Sadat did not take a single capitulatory step along the path which led up to his last parade without donning the ostentatious full-dress uniform of demagogical "demands" for setting up an independent Palestinian state, stopping the construction of Israeli settlements on occupied Arab territories and so forth.

However, it is well known that during his meetings with the Washington patron, the trappings of greatness dropped from As-Sadat's uniform, the air was full of verbal chaff, and the marshal's baton passed from the hand of the head of the Cairo regime to the hand of the White House boss. Washington dictated the conditions, and the so-called "demands" were removed from the agenda and replaced by more capitulatory concessions extorted from the Egyptian leadership under the U.S. Administration's pressure.

It is not impossible that when, on the eve of his visit to the United States, Mubarak expressed concern about the "sharp differences" in the Arab world, called for an end to the bloodbath in Lebanon, and stressed that the basis of a Near East settlement lay in the Palestinian problem, that this realistic approach is constrained by the grip of the Camp David vise, which deprives Cairo of genuine political independence. And U.S. economic "aid" serves as another instrument of blackmail by means of which the United States brings pressure to bear on Egypt.

For the sake of protocol and for the sake of fine words, Reagan, speaking to journalists after the talks with Mubarak, again demogogically proclaimed the "U.S. desire for a just and all-embracing peace in the Near East." But it was he himself who torpedoed this peace with his notorious Near East initiative and with U.S. Sixth Fleet ships. He spoke about determination "to support Lebanon's territorial integrity, sovereignty, and independence." But it was he himself who sanctioned the bombing of Lebanese territory by the U.S. Air Force and Navy and who violated Lebanese sovereignty by declaring that U.S. Marines will remain in that country for an indefinite period. Regan gave assurances that he would help "to secure the Palestinian people's legitimate rights." But it was he himself who actually backed the construction of Israeli settlements on the West Bank of the Jordan -- the territory where an independent Palestinian state was to have been set up.

And it was these exclusively verbal props which supported the table of the U.S.-Egyptian talks at which the United States insisted on discussing questions as far removed from peace as Capital Hill is from Suq al-Gharb hill in the suburbs of Beirut, shot to pieces by U.S. artillery. The topics of discussion were, specifically, the expansion of the "strategic cooperation" between the United States and Egypt, of which the U.S. military's recent maneuvers on Egyptian territory were a concrete expression; the use of Egypt as a transshipment point in arms transfers to Lebanon, military aid to Cairo totaling $1.4 billion; and deliveries to Egypt of 80 F-16 aircraft, 4 AWACS aircraft, tanks, and Harpoon missiles (the selfsame missiles with which the U.S. cruiser "Virginia" sowed death in Lebanese villages).

In Washington no secret is being made of the fact that all this hardware, which in some cases will be maintained by U.S. specialists, could be used in "extreme circumstances" for the needs of the United States itself to protect its "vital interests" in the Near East.

Egypt has also been promised economic "aid." But it was no accident when the Cairo paper AL-AHRAM wrote in this context that Washington's attitude toward Israel and Egypt is characterized by "two approaches, two yardsticks." While Tel Aviv gets a check which it can dispose of as it sees fit, conditions are dictated to Cairo. U.S. advisers check on the expenditure of every dollar, prescribing what is to be built and where and how. This results in money being spent mainly in the services sphere and on the construction of enterprises which do not contribute to the creation of an Egyptian economy which would be independent of the West. The businessmen's tactics are clear -- they provide the dollars to make a quick profit from the interest payable on credits. And meanwhile Egypt's economic indebtedness to the United States is growing. Whereas today the debt totals $3 billion, by 1990 it will have increased to $9.5 billion, according to AFP. Thus Egypt is gradually getting into deeper and deeper economic servitude to its Camp David deal partner.

After the conclusion of the talks in Washington Mubarak expressed "complete satisfaction with cooperation is all spheres," "welcomed" Reagan's Near East policy, and as THE WASHINGTON POST wrote, described the Egyptian-Israeli separate agreement as "the cornerstone of Egypt's policy."

But it is precisely the Camp David deal, the Egyptian-Israeli "peace" treaty, and the Reagan plan which are the stumbling block to a Near East settlement and a just solution to the Palestinian problem, it is they which have untied the hands of the Israeli aggressors and of the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force in the Near East.

As-Sadat once put on a show of being unwilling to give way to U.S. pressure and demonstratively tried to leave Camp David, But Carter gave orders that he should not be given a helicopter and made the Egyptian president his "prisoner". No one now prevents President Mubarak from taking off from Washington. But as the negotiations showed, Cairo remains the prisoner of Camp David, which has become the visible symbol of the anti-Arab collusion between the American imperialists and the Israeli Zionists.

SOVIET UNION CONDEMNS U.S. INVASION OF GRENADA

LD251530 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 25 Oct 83

["Statement of the Soviet Government" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS -- The United States' aggressive actions have caused a serious threat to the sovereignty and security of the Republic of Nicaragua, have led to the aggravation of the situation in the whole of Central America. Thousands of professional mercenaries are being sent into the Nicaraguan territory. They kill peaceful people, stage acts of sabotage at national economy facilities, try by every means to paralyze the peaceful life of the country. They have been trained at U.S. bases, armed with U.S. weapons. Their actions are masterminded and coordinate directly by the Central Intelligence Agency and other special services of the United States.

Washington does not limit itself to the use of counter-revolutionary scum which acts as the first echelon of the interventionist forces. The Nicaraguan people are threatened with outright invasion by U.S. forces. Dozens of warships have been concentrated by the Pentagon close to the Pacific and Atlantic coasts of Nicaragua. Large contingents of the U.S. Army were sent into neighbouring Honduras under the retext of exercises and give direct backing to gangs.

The official representatives of the United States make no secret that a war is actually being waged against Nicaragua. The aim of that war is to overthrow the lawful government of that sovereign state, to compel the Nicaraguan people to abandon its chosen road of development, to yield to U.S. diktat.

The U.S. Administration not only inspires and gives logistic support to the subversive actions against Nicaragua and other countries. It has made such actions part of its policy now. The recent statement of President Reagan about the "right" to conduct clandestine operations against independent states has been assessed even in the USA as a stake on conducting a policy of "state terrorism."

This is a direct challenge to all the states which have more than once jointly branded and rejected the policy of interference in the affairs of sovereign countries and peoples. This is a cynical hegemonistic claim to arbitrary and lawless behavior in international affairs. Washington's policy and practical deeds constitute a callous violation of the basic principles of international law, the UN Charter, and the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

From the example of Nicaragua it is clear what the real worth of Washington's talk on the subject of freedom, democracy and human rights is, what the moral standards it is guided by really are. It is clear to any unbiased person: As far as the present U.S. Administration is concerned, freedom, democracy and human rights end right there where the peoples cast off the chain of imperialist exploitation and embark on the road of really independent development.

Efforts to picture things in such a way that the Government of the USA favors a political settlement in Central America are the ultimate in hypocrisy. In actual fact it sabotages constructive efforts of Nicaragua, of other Latin American countries and demonstrates by practical deeds that it is not interested in a political solution to the problems of that region.

U.S. actions toward Nicaragua are a crime against the Nicaraguan people, a direct threat to the security and sovereignty of all the states of Latin America and an attempt at misappropriating by use of force the right to determine which system those or other countries should have, what foreign policy they should pursue.

All those who treasure peace and freedom should raise their voice in support of the just cause of Nicaragua, multiply efforts with a view to easing of tensions in the region of Central America, and stymie Washington's dangerous plans.

The Government of the USSR resolutely condemns the aggressive U.S. course with respect to Nicaragua and declares invariable solidarity of the Soviet people with the just struggle of the Nicaraguan people for independent and free development at their own choice. Interference in the affairs of Nicaragua must be stopped.

PREPARATIONS FOR INVASION OF GRENADA OBSERVED

LD251159 Moscow TASS in English 1029 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 25 TASS -- The UPI news agency reports from Washington that a "DC-9" military transportation plane with Marines on board and three U.S. combat helicopters have landed in Barbados. Immediately after landing the soldiers started reloading arms and equipment from the plane to the helicopters. A spokesman of the U.S. Embassy in Barbados who was at the airport told a UPI correspondent that the air squadron arrived obtensibly to prepare for evacuation of American citizens who are in Grenada and that the arms may be needed to ensure their security.

Preparation for a direct armed intervention -- this is how observers view the provocative fuss which Washington and pro-American Carribbean regimes have launched with regard to Grenada. News agencies' reports note a concentration of invasion forces in Barbados. Armed contingents from Antigua, Saint Lucia, and Jamaica have already arrived there. At the same time ships of the U.S. Navy entered the territorial waters of Grenada. A big U.S. aircraft-carrier force led by the helicopter carrier "Guam" as well as a frigate and the missile-carrying cruiser "Antrim" of the British Navy continue to head for that small country in the Caribbean.

Havana October 25 TASS -- Preparations for an armed aggression against Grenada, which have been carried out in the last few days, says the dispatch from a PRENSA LATINA agency correspondent from Saint Georges, reached their climax Sunday evening after the decision has been learnt of the organisation of East Caribbean States to launch an invasion of Grenada. The state of combat readiness declared by the Revolutionary Military Council in connection with the possible attack against the island remains. The authorities reported on mobilising the country's Armed Forces and people's militia.

The Revolutionary Military Council has addressed a note to the U.S. Embassy in Barbados expressing, among other things, concern over the fact that in many reports the United States is named as a participant in the invasion force against Grenada. The Revolutionary Military Council, the note goes on to say, has information to the effect that two naval ships are patrolling Grenada's territorial waters at a distance of 12-15 kilometres from the coast.

The note stresses that any foreign invasion is a crude violation of Grenada's sovereignty and the existing international laws. Apart from that, such an invasion would involve the death of hundreds of men, women and children. Grenada declares that it does not wish confrontation with any country or group of countries, that is ready to hold talks for ensuring normal relations and mutual understanding with other states.

The Revolutionary Military Council has reaffirmed that the security of the citizens of the USA and other countries resident in Grenada is fully guaranteed.

London October 25 TASS -- The newspaper MORNING STAR issued here, points to the real threat of American invasion of Grenada with the participation of Britain. The dispatch to Grenada's coasts of missile cruiser "Antrim", the newspaper stresses, is evidence of the fact that Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher fully supports Reagan's "gunboat diplomacy".

Caracas October 25 TASS -- Washington's militaristic manoeuvers against Grenada have been strongly condemned by vice chairman of the Socialist International, former President of Venezuela Carlos Andres Perez. The United States, he said, shall under no pretext threaten the sovereignty of the countries in our region.

U.S.-LED 'INTERVENTION' IN GRENADA REPORTED

Caribbean, British Roles Noted

LD251206 Moscow TASS in English 1143 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Saint George October 25 TASS -- A foreign armed intervention guided by the U.S. Administration was unleashed against revolutionary Grenada at dawn today. At five hours 50 minutes A.M. of local time aircraft dropped paratroopers of the interventionists not far from the capital in the area of the international airport under construction. A fierce exchange of fire between the paratroopers and defenders of the island is going on. At the same time several U.S. naval ships have appeared off the shores of Grenada.

The invasion of Grenada was preceded by a summit meeting of the Caribbean Community (Caricom), at which the heads of governments of Jamaica, Barbados, Saint Lucia and Antigua agreed to include their military contingents into the interventionist forces. The troops of the interventionists were massed in Barbados, where American Marine units were airlifted from the USA yesterday.

The aim of the imperialist intervention is to put a stop to the revolutionary process in Grenada and again subordinate that country to neocolonialist rule.

According to a Guyana radio report, President Forbes Burnham of Guyana has strongly condemned the aggression and said that he had warned about such a course of developments.

British troops are taking part in the armed intervention.

According to a report of the "Free Grenada" radio station, the invasion force is led by the American Marine units, who are on an offensive in the area of the airport with artillery support from the U.S. naval ships.

Three heavy military transport planes with American airborne troops have landed in the airport.

The radio station "Free Grenada" has ceased its transmissions.

New York October 25 TASS -- A correspondent of the U.S. CBS television company has confirmed in his dispatch from Barbados that the American Marines are taking a direct part in the armed intervention against Grenada.

In other words, the participation of military contingents from some Caribbean countries in the invasion is, as a matter of fact, a fig leaf to cover the U.S. intervention.

'Independence' Leads Warships

LD251729 Moscow TASS in English 1716 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] New York, October 25 TASS -- According to news dispatches, the scope of U.S. intervention in Grenada is constantly growing. AP reports, quoting Pentagon sources, that at present 11 combat ships of the U.S. Navy led by the aircraft carrier "Independence" with 70 planes on board are currently taking part in the operation against Grenada.

Airport Seized

LD251823 Moscow World Service in English 1800 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] In defiance of the rights of sovereign states to independence, the United States is expanding its direct aggression against Grenada. Reports say that units of American Marines have seized in Grenada two airports following pitched battles with the defenders of the island. Transport aircraft have brought more American landing troops to Grenada.

President Reagan has admitted in Washington that U.S. troops have landed in Grenada. The President claimed that the action is aimed at restoring order on the island, and thereby again claimed the right to impose on sovereign states a social and political system desirable to Washington.

The secretary general of the Organization of American States, Alejandro Orfila, has assessed the situation that has arisen from the invasion as very grave. The aggression has been condemned by President Burnham of Guyana.

Cubans Killed, Wounded

LD260422 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] The United States is scaling up its armed intervention in Grenada. The invasion was mounted Tuesday morning. There are already more than 2,000 American Marines in Grenada and off its coasts there are some 20 American warships led by the aircraft carrier "Independence" with 70 planes on board. The involvement of troops from some other countries is a mere fig leaf. The United States is again trying to establish by force the system it desires in a sovereign country. News agencies report that Grenadian troops are standing up to the invader, inflicting casualties on him. Some American helicopters have been downed. The brazen United States aggression has drawn angry protests from many countries. Mass demonstrations of solidarity with the people of Grenada are taking place in Cuba, Guyana and other Latin American countries. Nicaragua and Libya have demanded to urgently call the Security Council to discuss American aggression. The Cuban Government says that according to information from its mission in St. George's, Grenada, United States paratroops in the small hours on Tuesday landed in the region of a new airport under construction in Grenada. The operation was carried out near the camps of Cuban builders who were instructed to defend themselves if attacked. Reports indicate that the American invading troops have attacked the camps and places of work of the Cuban personnel, killing and wounding some Cubans.

Caribbean Collusion 'Coverup'

LD251629 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 25 TASS -- The NBC television company reports that Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Charles Percy announced after a meeting with President Ronald Reagan that 1,900 U.S. Marines are involved in the operation for the invasion in Grenada. Reports that reach here say that six jumbo military transport C-130 aircraft and two C-141 jet transport aircraft were used to airlift interventionist forces from Barbados.

In other words, the participation of army units of certain Caribbean countries in the invasion in an actual fact a fig-leaf to cover-up the intervention staged by the United States.

The invasion of Grenada by U.S. troops is a blunder, said W. Smith, prominent expert in Latin American problems, former head of a department representing U.S. interests in Cuba, in a NBC television interview. He emphasised that the U.S. intervention in that small nation in the Caribbean could not be justified in any way.

Georgetown October 25 TASS -- According to the Voice of Barbados radio station, the U.S. troops which landed in Grenada announced the establishment of a 50-mile military zone around the island. Any plane to appear within the zone will be regarded as a hostile one by the multinational force. The Voice of Barbados also reports that during the troop landing a U.S. combat helicopter was downed by the defenders of the island, and its pilot wounded.

U.S. Losses 'Admitted'

LD252242 Moscow TASS in English 2221 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Washington October 25 TASS -- A high-ranking representative of the Pentagon issued a statement in which he actually admitted that the United States had staged the invasion of Grenada. The data cited by him confirms that the participation in the invasion corps of soldiers from Jamaica, Barbados and some Caribbean countries, the United States' satellites, is merely a camouflage of the unilateral U.S. military aggression against an independent Caribbean state.

According to the information of the Pentagon's representative, at least 1,900 U.S. Marines and "Rangers", special forces that were widely used for massacres of peaceful population in Vietnam, have taken part in the invasion. The total numerical strength of the forces of eastern Caribbean states involved by Washington in the aggression against Grenada is not over 300 people. And their forces were kept from participating in the first stages of the invasion of Grenada when a landing force seized the Point-Salinas airport and other objects early in the morning of October 25.

Reagan Assertions Assailed

LD252002 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1832 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Washington, 25 Oct (TASS) -- President R. Reagan has made an attempt that is even rare for the current White House in its hypocrisy to justify the impudent aggression by the United States against sovereign Grenada, aggression which has been implemented in violation of the UN Charter and the fundamental norms of international law. At a press conference which he called in haste today, Reagan asserted that allegedly the armed incursion into Grenada was undertaken "at the urgent official request" of several countries in the Caribbean Basin which allegedly requested the United States "to assist the joint efforts to restore order and democracy" in Grenada. This false assertion, according to an AP report, is refuted even by a State Department representative who said that the U.S. Administration took the decision to land troops on Grenada back in the middle of last week, that is several days before the meeting in Port of Spain. The abovementioned "request" by U.S. satellites has been used by the White House to conceal American "gunboat diplomacy."

With characteristic cynicism, Reagan asserted that Washington's "decisive action" was undertaken for three reasons -- "to defend the lives of innocent people, including Americans," "to prevent further chaos" in Grenada and lastly "to give assistance in the restoration of law and order" as well as of "the democratic institutions" on that island. Every word in the President's reasoning is a lie. The falsehood of the first of these "explanations" was essentially revealed by the head of the White House himself when he admitted in the press conference that, to the best of the Administration's knowledge all U.S. citizens in Grenada "are safe."

Only yesterday official representatives of the State Department and the White House said the same. That American citizens in Grenada have not been in any danger can be concluded also from the fact that the Grenadian Government has repeatedly and in public guaranteed their security to Washington.

The other two "reasons" set forth by the President are essentially a confirmation of some U.S. "right" to establish its own ways in any country that follows a course independent from Washington, a course not to Washington's liking, to impose "American-style democracy" there through the Marines' bayonets, in this way trampling in the crudest fashion on the legitimate rights of the peoples of other countries and on the generally recognized norms of international law. This is open international piracy and banditry, and no reasoning can conceal this indisputable fact, nor release the Washington rulers from responsibility for the crimes they are perpetrating on Grenadian territory.

Landing Planned Last Week

LD251919 Moscow TASS in English 1850 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Washington October 25 TASS -- The Reagan administration adopted the decision to land U.S. forces on Grenada in the middle of last week. The ASSOCIATED PRESS was told this by an official from the U.S. Department of State who preferred that his name should not be revealed.

According to him Washington started receiving back on Friday the intelligence information necessary for the preparation of a landing on Grenada. The intelligence data included the information on the most convenient places for the landing, on the approaches to Grenada from sea, on the deployment of the Grenadian security forces and the position of arms depots. It is precisely with the use of such information that operations are planned, the official said.

He confirmed that the United States decision to invade Grenada had been taken long before today's statement by President Reagan in which he tried to explain this interventionist action by a "request" from a number of Caribbean countries.

According to the ASSOCIATED PRESS report, the official of the State Department confirmed that the United States had no evidence that American citizens in Grenada were in some sort of "danger." Thus another lie of the White House has been exposed. The White House said that the landing of an armed force on Grenada was allegedly undertaken to "protect" the lives of American citizens.

'Incursion' Details

LD252115 Moscow TASS in English 2043 GMT 25 GMT 83

[Text] New York October 25 TASS -- Grenadian people are courageously resisting invading forces, according to U.S. television networks. CNN reported quoting Pentagon sources that U.S. troops were suffering losses. But the Defence Department spokesmen had declined to give any details.

According to the United Press International, combat was under way in three key areas of the island. Reporting details of the incursion into Grenada, ASSOCIATED PRESS said that Marines had landed by helicopter early in the morning outside Pearls Airport, along the country's northeastern coast, while Army rangers from among special operations units, which gained notoriety for their atrocities in Vietnam, had parachuted near the international airport Point Salines.

U.S. 'Aggressors' Resisted

LD252155 Moscow TASS in English 2141 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Georgetown October 26 TASS -- According to the latest reports from Saint Georges fighting in Grenada continues. The U.S. aggressors have not yet completely broken the resistance of the Armed Forces and people's militia of Grenada although they have seized a number of key positions, including airports. Casualties are reported on both sides but the precise numbers of killed and wounded are not known.

'Selfless' Cubans in Battle

LD262156 Moscow TASS in English 2136 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Havana October 25 TASS -- The fourth statement of the Cuban Government issued today says that according to reports that came from the Cuban Embassy in Grenada, Cuban builders and other specialists by 11:30 a.m. local time continued rebuffing at different places of the hostels, work areas and small adjoining heights the criminal, sudden and treacherous attacks of the U.S. land and naval forces which launched against them troops, artillery, fighter-planes and helicopters.

The document says that with admirable persistance and staunchness Cuban doctors, teachers and technicians rendering selfless assistance to the fraternal people of small Grenada are now waging the unprecedented battle against American soldiers. They are thus showing to the world an example of heroism, solidarity and selflessness which will become the symbol of peoples' will torebuff the criminal and unfounded aggressive, fascist policy of the United States Government.

Though there is no exact information on Grenadian fighters yet, there is confidence that they are exerting as stubborn a resistance, the statement says.

Cuban Ammunition Shortage

LD252254 Moscow TASS in English 2240 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Havana October 26 TASS -- The latest urgent statement of the Cuban Government says that after seven hours of fighting certain pockets of defence and nearby hills have fallen to the enemy after their defenders, Cuban builders and other specialists in Grenada, ran out of ammunition.

Staunch and heroic resistance continues in difficult conditions against heavy odds at other sections despite shortages of ammunition.

'Revolutionary Morale' High

LD260821 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Read by Karl Yegorov]

[Text] The American interventionists are sowing death and destruction in Grenada, a small island country in the Caribbean. The invasion, supported by artillery fire of American warships and bombings by military aircraft, began yesterday. The aggressors, however, have been unable to crush the resistance of the people. Fighting continues in different parts of the island, including the capital, St Georges. The assertions of President Reagan that the aims of the invasion have been fully met were denied by reports from Grenada. American Marines and Ranger units are trying unsuccessfully to capture the strongholds of Grenada's Army and the people's militia, who have risen to defend their country. The PRENSA LATINA news agency says the revolutionary morale of the defenders is high and the resolve strong. The Cuban construction workers in Grenada are taking part in the resistance.

A Radio Moscow observer says the brutal aggression is being conducted under the pretext of restoring democracy, as was announced by Mr Reagan, when he ordered the invasion of Grenada. According to a Washington administration spokesman, the question is now being discussed of sending units of the 82d U.S. Airborne Division to the island, which conducted ruthless punitive operations in Vietnam.

U.S. GRENADA ATTACK 'SAME OLD GUNBOAT DIPLOMACY'

LD251734 Moscow TASS in English 1655 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Nikolay Chigir writes: The "peace-makers'" mask the Reagan administration had been donning has been cast off. The bandit-style armed intervention against Grenada has exposed before the whole world the U.S. Government's true visage -- the visage of an aggressor. Reports from Grenada and other Caribbean countries do not leave even a shade of doubt that what is taking place is a large-scale militarist action that has been planned and prepared by Washington against the independent Grenadian state in advance with a view to cutting short the revolutionary process that began in the island in 1979 and subordinate Grenada to U.S. neocolonialist rule.

Taking advantage of the complicated situation that has taken shape inside that country, the Reagan government hurriedly activated the military, political and diplomatic mechanisms of its interventionist policy in the Western Hemisphere. U.S. naval groups carrying a large U.S. Marine contingent were immediately dispatched to Grenadian shores. As soon as that armada approached the island, the Marines launched a landing operation supported by aircraft and artillery gunfire from warships.

The United States staged an act of direct, unprovoked aggression against a state that is a full-fledged member of the United Nations Organisation. By having insolently flouted the fundamental principles of the U.N. Charter and the basic standards of international law, the Reagan government demonstrated total disregard for the world community. It was confirmed once again that this government is banking only on the force of arms to attain its imperialist aims and thrust its diktat on other countries and nations. The U.S. armed incursion into Grenada is the same old, ill-famed gunboat diplomacy that U.S. imperialists have been employing in the Western Hemisphere since the start of the century, only now it is being used with unheard-of international banditry and international terrorism that have been adopted by the present Washington contenders for the role of the world's rulers as the main tools of their policy.

What is taking place, and this should be emphasised once again, is direct U.S. armed intervention against the Grenadian people. As to the involvement in it of the East Caribbean states that are ruled by pro-American puppet regimes, it is nothing more than a fig leaf used by Washington, in the same way as it has done this on more than one occasion before, to create the semblance of a "collective" action. But isn't it clear that the Reagan administration was the only author of the script in accordance with which an emergency meeting of the heads of government of the Caricom countries was convened in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, on the eve of the invasion of Grenada? The subregional organisation of the East Caribbean states at the meeting rubberstamped a Washington-dictated decision on intervention.

President Reagan's claims that the armed invasion of Grenada had been carried out to "protect innocent lives" and to restore "law and order" sounded as blasphemy, as the mockery of common sense, of the Grenadian people who have fallen victim to the armed violence of latter-day crusaders, and of the whole of mankind. There is indeed no limit to the hypocrisy, pharisaism and demagoguery of the incumbent Washington leaders.

U.S. aggression against Grenada is a challenge to the entire world community. It is a heavy blow to the cause of peace and international security. All responsibility for the consequences of this criminal act rests with the Washington administration and personally with President Reagan.

Laying disgrace on the U.S. aggressors, peace-loving mankind demands that the interventionist troops of the United States and its puppets be immediately pulled out of Grenada and that the Grenadian people be given an opportunity for administering their internal affairs themselves without any outside interference.

ARBATOV: U.S. WANTS 'SMALL, GLORIOUS WAR'

LD251858 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1844 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] America's invasion of Grenada is similar to Britain's war over the Falklands, a senior Soviet official said today.

Prof Georgiy Arbatov, a former adviser to Soviet leader Yuriy Andropov, told a London news conference that the invasion showed "the real intentions of this (the Reagan) administration".

The Americans had not got over their Vietnam syndrome.

"They may want a nice, small glorious war like you had in the Falklands. Maybe that is the idea of it. It is very dangerous."

Prof Arbatov, director of the Institute of United States and Canadian Studies in Moscow, said Grenada's people were not blameless for what had happened.

"But the Americans used it, immediately proving the case of an imperialistic policy."

Prof Arbatov, who was in London to launch his book, "Cold War or Detente -- the Soviet Viewpoint," was asked if the Russians intended to break off the arms control negotiations in Geneva if the American cruise and Pershing missiles were deployed in Europe.

He replied: "By the deployment of the weapons, the United States will torpedo the talks in Geneva and make them baseless. The talks were intended to prevent a new round in the arms race. If deployment began, the reasons for the talks would have evaporated."

He added: "We have to face the fact that the United States is being run by a rather: polftically extremist administration.

"Mentally, it seems to have returned not only to the Cold War but to the 1920's when the Soviet Union was regarded as an anomaly -- an historical accident."

GRENADA 'VICTIM' OF U.S. 'IMPERIAL POLICY'

LD251626 Moscow World Service in English 1531 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Armed foreign intervention has begun in revolutionary Grenada. The Grenada radio station has reported that troops were landed by aircraft. American marines, covered by artillery fire from United States' naval ships, are leading an attack on the republic's capital St Georges. Ronald Reagan, speaking on television, has confirmed United States' participation in the invasion. Now, comments by Leonid (Filatov):

Grenada has become the victim of Washington's imperial policy. The current administration of the United States for the past few years has been planning reprisals against the Grenada revolution which in 1979 launched independent development. President Reagan has on many occasions made flagrant attacks on Grenada. Taking advantage of the complicated situation on the island, Washington has implemented its interventionist plans. Using concocted pretexts, the Reagan administration sent over 20 warships to Grenada's shores. Speaking in Washington on the subject, the President cynically said that the goal was to demonstrate the determination of the United States to defend its so-called backyard and not to permit, as he said, communist presence in the Western Hemisphere.

In this way Washington is indicating that Grenada is only the first target of United States' armed intervention in the affairs of countries in the Caribbean and in Central America whose policies do not suit the United States.

The United States Administration does not conceal that its interventionist plans apply as well to Nicaragua and Cuba who, along with Grenada, are on Washington's blacklist. In order to cover its armed intervention, Washington has persuaded some countries in the Caribbean to take part.

The British Government also sent to the shores of Grenada warships, including the missile cruiser "Antrim." Incidentally, last year the cruiser was involved in British aggression against Argentina over the Falkland Islands in the South Atlantic. The United States supported that aggression and now the NATO allies are working together on the aggression against Grenada.

United States intervention against Grenada shows how dangerous Washington's militaristic policy is to the world. Solidarity with the people of Grenada -- victims of intervention -- is a decisive "no" to those who are counting on dividing up the world the way they want.

ANGLO-AMERICAN 'AMBITIONS' IN CARIBBEAN ASSAILED

LD252153 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] American news reports say American paratroops with helicopter gunships have invaded the Caribbean island of Grenada. According to the NBC network, the operation also involves British troops. Anatoliy Gan of our staff makes the following comment:

What's happened in Grenada is an unprovoked aggression against a sovereign nation, an aggression launched in contempt of international law and the United Nations Charter. As a pretext, Washington and London have claimed concern about the fate of American and British nationals in Grenada. As the British press has acknowledged, both the White House and Whitehall would be happy to do away with the revolutionary developments in Grenada. To this end, the Americans have sent there a group of warships led by the aircraft carrier "Invincible" [as heard]. The British have contributed the cruiser "Antrim" and a frigate to show once again they are ready to support any of Washington's adventures. With Washington holding the stage, London does not seem to realize how pitiable it looks when trying to assert its own imperial ambitions. The Anglo-American intervention in Grenada apparently has two objectives: to suppress the revolutionary process in this small sovereign country and install a neocolonial regime there, and to intimidate other independent nations in the Caribbean. It is also fresh proof as to who is actually creating uncertainty and sources of tension and war in the world. Washington and London don't realize that trying to use the old gunboat diplomacy in this age of decolonization is fraught with serious consequences. The heavy losses that Britain suffered in its colonial war to retake the Falklands are an example.

GRENADA OFFENSIVE 'SERIOUS THREAT' TO NICARAGUA

LD260307 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 25 Oct 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Vladimir Dunayev]

[Text] Hello, comrades. You must have heard already about the present incursion into the territory of revolutionary Grenada, about the U.S. intervention, about the fighting which continues on the island. Harold Wilson, the former British prime minister, coined the expression: A week is a long time in politics. Sometimes even 1 day is a long time, especially a day like today [video shows shots of Grenadian coast, helicopters and transport aircraft in the air and on the ground, and shots of trucks being unloaded].

You can see the invasion [vtorzheniye] as it is unfolding, as U.S. helicopters and military transport aircraft are landing U.S. Marines. Today at a press conference in the White House where President Reagan announced the intervention, he was asked this question: What reason, what right has the United States to invade an independent country? Reagan would not be drawn into answering this question: His answer is the Marines, his answer is intervention [video displays shot of U.S. magazine illustration showing U.S. Marine standing by map of the world showing flashpoints since 1945].

Take a look at this pictogram of U.S. armed intervention which was published in the American journal U.S. NEWS in April of this year. The pictogram is out of date already. Grenada has not yet been marked by one of these "bursts" denoting incursions by U.S. Marines and troops. Each "burst" signifies an American aggression. In the Near East there is a whole constellation of Pentagon "bursts". In the Far East there are plenty of them too. Of course, not everything figures on this map. The compilers of this picture of American aggressions have been rather modest [shot of map of Grenada and surrounding area]. And here you see the Western Hemisphere. Now here they will paint a Pentagon "burst" in the area of Grenada also.

As a result of the aggressive action by the United States, a serious threat is raised against the sovereignty and security of the Republic of Nicaragua. The situation in the whole of Central America has been exacerbated, says the Soviet Government statement. The Voice of Nicaragua radio station assessed the U.S. armed invasion of Grenada as a rehearsal for a mass intervention in Central America by U.S. imperialism.

A report from Havana: According to the latest reports, the U.S. forces which landed on Grenada have attacked the camps and work places of Cuban personnel. The people of Cuba -- says a [Cuban] -- Government statement -- will be kept informed about the course of events taking place. Another special statement by the Cuban revolutionary government, which was issued later, says that U.S. Marines have surrounded the camps of Cuban construction workers who have offered heroic resistance. There are some dead and wounded among the Cuban personnel.

According to news agency reports, the scale of the U.S. intervention in Grenada is growing constantly. AP reports, with reference to Pentagon spokesmen, that at present 11 U.S. warships led by the aircraft carrier independence with 70 aircraft on board are engaged in the operation against Grenada. The Nicaraguan Government has called for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to discuss the issue of the U.S. intervention against Grenada. A spokesman for the U.N. secretary general stated that Perez de Cuellar is following with deep concern the development of events in Grenada, and is holding consultations with the Security Council chairman. He is concerned that the escalation of tension may complicate further the difficult situation in the region.

IZVESTIYA ON U.S. CENTRAL, SOUTH AMERICA POLICY

PM211344 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by Valentin Falin under the rubric "A Political Observer's View": "Democracy by the Megaton"]

[Text] For some time now we have heard the United States measuring its corn, wheat, and soybean harvests in megatons. What they mean by this is that not only a nuclear bomb, but also a corncob or soybean destined for export carries a powerful explosive charge. The desire and good weather are all that is needed.

U.S. democracy's "surpluses" are now export-bound. Not, needless to say, in order to encourage all sorts of demonstrations and other types of civic activity abroad. Even at home R. Reagan panics in the face of the ground swell of public indignation. He has taken steps to ensure that the socially disadvantaged, people who reject the administration's militarist policy, and members of the public who demand genuine respect for other states and peoples do not get near the White House and disturb its occupant.

If he had his way, the President would slap a total ban on protests. But it cannot be helped, he has to cut his coat according to his cloth and, giving vent to his annoyance, dismiss malcontents as "bums," "subversives," and "antipatriots" standing in the way of the glorification of the United States and its struggle for U.S. "world leadership."

So when you are dealing with democracy, you need an eagle eye. What if -- God forbid -- "high technology" democracy comes along, who will sort things out then? It needs to be uncomplicated, and -- most important of all -- let nobody take it into his head to translate the word "democracy" literally. Then they will start dreaming about people's power. Why not just be content with power over the people? And it needs to be stricter, people should earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, as befits true Christians.

I do not know whether the head of the present administration has read the works of the German idealist philosopher Hegel or has intuitively grasped his formula: Everything rational exists and everything which exists is rational. Exploitation, social inequality, and national oppression exist, so let them go on existing. This is perfectly rational -- from the U.S. ruling class's standpoint. It is even imperative, since if so much as a single stone is removed the foundations of the whole of the American way of life will be shaken.

Hence the hold-tight-and-don't-let-go ethic. And even better, proclaim as rational only that part of what exists which fits in with imperialist thinking, coincides with U.S. great-power interests, is grist to its mill, and brings profits to U.S. monopolies. And this will be that soughtafter, unique, exemplary, and inviolable brand of democracy which everyone should adopt submissively and meekly for their own good. Or else you'll be shown which is the greater evil.

U.S. leaders have long regarded Central and South America as the most suitable place for "democratic experiments." Such outstanding "democrats" as Somoza, Batista, Stroessner, Duvalier, and Pinochet have ruled or have been ruling there for years, in some cases decades, with Washington' blessing and encouragement. With their help the Latin American peoples' blood and tears have been and are being turned into the multibillion-dollar profits flowing annually into U.S. banks.

This partnership has not exactly delighted the oppressed and exploited. The number of military expeditions and executions carried out in the 20th century alone by the United States in order to make clear to recalcitrants where their happiness lies on is incalculable. Before the existence of free Cuba and Nicaragua, it was so much easier to maintain order. Out would come the "big stick," and one's "dirty laundry" was concealed.

And no one would be the wiser unless someone blew the whistle.

Nowadays the stick has to be covered with democratic velvet, a democratic fog has to be created in front of warships and marines, and people summoned to testify that the human rights situation in, say, Chile, El Salvador or Guatemala is "improving." Different times prompt different appraoches. There is now even talk of reforms to improve the broad masses' economic plight. Not for reasons of justice or philanthropy, but in order to make people less susceptible to "subversive ideas."

Next it occurred to them: What if we bestow North American "democracy" on Central and South America? It is no longer possible to suppress the masses' energy. All we can do is to try and channel it in a way which suits the United States.

R. Reagan personally explained the rules of the game thus: The peoples of the Western Hemisphere can choose any form of government except a socialist one, are entitled to espouse any philosophy, with the exception of Marxism-Leninism, and can be friends with any country, provided it is not the USSR or one of its friends. It goes without saying that the smartest move would be to forget old grudges and new wounds, and to salute the Stars and Stripes and swear to be prepared to die for it.

People willing to take up Washington's call have been found. R. Reagan's "democratic ideas" have been echoed in the hearts of...the military leaders of El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, and Panama. Gathered together early in October on the Santo Tomas estate, not far from the Guatemalan capital, they "examined the situation in Central America, which is in conflict with external Marxist-Leninist aggression threatening democracy and freedom of choice for the peoples in Central America," as the final communique put it. Presiding over the gathering of devotees of the Reagan version of "democracy and the peoples' freedom" was none other than General P. Gorman, commander in chief of the U.S. Southern Military Command [as published]. According to reports, he was pleased with his fellow thinkers' astuteness. Foreign news agencies regard this event as a step "aimed at unleashing a de facto war against Nicaragua."

With the energetic participation of the CIA, the Pentagon, and the State Department, "democracy" is being translated into kilotons. Washington is not satisfied with the 40,000 Salvadorans killed in 1980. It is not satisfied with the tens of thousands who died at the hands of U.S. stooges in Guatemala following the overthrow of the democratic Arbenz administration. It is not satisfied with the present scale of acts of subversion committed against Nicaragua from Honduran territory. Everything should be completely quiet in Central America. As quiet as the grave. And on major holidays let dictators hailed as people's tribunes arrange for wreaths of gratitude to be laid at monuments to U.S.-style "peace" and "democracy," under whose yoke the exploited are having to sweat more and to weep more bitterly.

NICARAGUA CALLS FOR TROOP WITHDRAWAL FROM GRENADA

LD260805 Moscow TASS in English 0723 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Managua October 26 TASS -- The national leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front and the Guiding Council of the Nicaraguan Government has held an emergency meeting in the Nicaraguan capital to discuss the explosive situation in the region as a result of aggressive actions of the United States and, specifically, the U.S. armed invasion of Grenada. After the meeting, Daniel Ortega, member of the national leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front and coordinator of the Guiding Council, read out the government's appeal to the Nicaraguan people, to the governments and all peoples of the world.

The Reagan Administration, says the appeal, is speeding up the implementation of large-scale aggressive designs in Central America, which cover Nicaragua and El Salvador. The armed occupation of Grenada by American troops is an act of gross arbitrariness, and it cannot be justified by any arguments. The U.S. intervention in Grenada confirms once again Washington's militarist, aggressive aspirations. Under these conditions, the Nicaraguans should, as never before, be vigilant and ready to repulse any encroachment on their revolutionary gains and the sovereignty of Nicaragua.

Along with the armed invasion of Grenada, the appeal points out, the U.S. Government summoned a conference of the chieftains of the military regimes of Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras within the framework of the so-called Central American Defence Council. Its objective is to work out concrete plans of aggression against Nicaragua. U.S. troops have already been concentrated on Honduran territory, U.S. warships are in Central American waters, and terrorist actions against Nicaragua are on the increase. Nicaragua's revolutionary government knows of the CIA'S intention to provoke shortly armed attacks and acts of sabotage at economic facilities in Honduras and Costa Rica in order to lay the blame for them on Nicaragua and create a pretext for launching still broader aggression against the Republic.

The Guiding Council of the Nicaraguan Government brings to notice of the world public these plans directed at kindling an armed conflict in the region. The U.S. Government ignores all peace initiatives advanced by Nicaragua, including the concrete draft treaties on pace and security sent by the Republic to the U.S. Department of State. Arrogance and lack of common sense, characteristic of the Reagan Administration's actions, are leading towards universal war in Central America.

The Nicaraguan Government called on the world community to use all means at its disposal to prevent the escalation of U.S. imperialism's aggression against Nicaragua and El Salvador and achieve an immediate withdrawal of invader troops from Grenadian territory.

GUATEMALAN REBELS HIT U.S. 'INTERVENTION' POLICY

LD251638 Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Bogota October 25 TASS -- Guatemala's guerrilla armed forces have strongly condemned the interventionist policy of the USA in Central America. The statement issued here by these guerrilla elements says that Washington is trying to suppress the national liberation movement in the region and is preparing a direct armed aggression against Nicaragua. Under the pretext of combatting the "penetration of communism" the Reagan administration is building up military assistance to the puppet reactionary regimes of Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador.

The statement by the Guatemalan patriots urges the peoples of Central America to step up the struggle for genuine independence and come out in a united front against the intervention of U.S. imperialism.

Managua October 25 TASS -- The Reagan administration is feverishly preparing to sign a military treaty with the reactionary Honduran regime, that would "legalise" the American military presence in Central America. According to reports from Tegucigalpa, the Honduran military refer to it as a decided matter.

According to the designs of the White House, the official sealing of the military alliance, which has already long existed between the USA and Honduras, will give it a free hand for the use of American troops in an armed aggression against Nicaragua under the pretext of defence of its allies from communist threat. At the same time that military treaty would pave the way for massive U.S. arms supplies to the Honduran Army, which has been chosen by Washington to perform the role of a policeman protecting the interests of the USA in the region.

CHERNENKO, PONOMAREV MEET MEXICAN PARTY DELEGATES

LD252246 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Politburo member and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, Konstantin Chernenko, and alternate Politburo member and secretary of the Central Committee, Boris Ponomarev, met on Monday in the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee with a delegation from the United Socialist Party of Mexico. The delegation was led by general secretary of the Central Committee of the Mexican Party, Pablo Comez. And now the details:

The delegations of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the United Socialist Party of Mexico exchanged opinions on the international situation. They condemned the adventurist and aggressive policy of the ruling circles in the United States, a policy of confrontation and the arms race. They noted plans by the United States and its NATO allies to place new missiles in Western Europe and their attempts to gain military superiority over the socialist countries pose a genuine threat to peace and security. The current situation requires united and active actions of all peaceable, progressive, and democratic forces to rebuff the bellicose imperialist circles and block their criminal plans.

The delegation of the United Socialist Party of Mexico highly praised all the efforts the Soviet Union is making to preserve peace. It noted that the statement made by Yuriy Andropov on 28 September is geared to achieve disarmament and is a valuable contribution by the Soviet Union to efforts to strengthen peace and is in harmony with the numerous appeals of various political and public forces and governments of many countries. Representatives of both parties noted that an integral part of Washington's global aggressive policy is the increasingly brazen interventionist actions of the United States and its satellites against Nicaragua and other countries in Central America and the Caribbean and the unending campaign of blackmail and threats against socialist Cuba.

Participants in the meeting expressed solidarity with the people of Latin America fighting for freedom and their inalienable right to determine their own system.

The Mexican comrades talked about their party's efforts for the vital rights of the people in the country, for democracy, popular and national policy in the current economic crisis. They also talked about the efforts the party is making with other progressive patriotic movements and organizations to defend national interests in the face of pressure from American imperialism on Mexico. The pressure is meant to force Mexico to relinquish its independent policy against United States interventionism in Central America.

The Soviet representatives said that despite imperialist procations the Soviet Union will continue to consistently pursue a policy to ease international tension, curb the arms race, limit and eliminate nuclear weapons and all types of weapons of mass destruction. The Soviet Union will firmly defend its sovereign rights and interests and will give the appropriate answer to any attempt to upset the current military-stragetic balance.

MEXICAN DELEGATE HOLDS MOSCOW PRESS CONFERENCE

LD2514[illegible], Moscow TASS in English 1114 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS -- "The struggle for the lessening of international tension, for the reduction of all the types of nuclear weapons is the imperative necessity for all the states and nations." This has been stated by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the United Socialist Party of Mexico Pablo Gomez Alvarez. He spoke today at a press conference here, which was devoted to the results of a visit of the party delegation to the Soviet Union. The guests visited the Soviet Union at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

During the talks with CPSU leaders, the sides reiterated the identity of views on many topical international problems, including the state of Soviet-Mexican relations, problems connected with the deployment in Western Europe of new American medium-range nuclear missiles and the escalation of the U.S. aggressive imperialist policy in Central America.

"Our delegation voiced complete support for the statement of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Yuriy Andropov, which expresses the desire of all the peace-loving forces of the planet to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. We believe that this document can open the way to the limitation of nuclear araments and to disarmament," he said further. The struggle for peace is the most burning problem of today, and all the nations on the earth irrespective of their political and religious convictions should take part in it, the head of the Mexican delegation pointed out.

The United Socialist Party of Mexico and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union expressed solidarity with the Central American nations which became the target of the growing aggressive interference on the part of the United States, Pablo Gomez pointed out. Both parties support the efforts of the "Contadora group," as well as the initiatives of Cuba and Nicaragua, aimed at a peaceful political solution of problems in that explosive region.

P. Gomez denounced the hypocritical policy of Washington, which in word supports the stand of the "Contadora group," while actually stepping up interference in the internal affairs of Central American countries.

In conclusion the head of the Mexican delegation stressed the need to create a new international economic order and spoke in favour of establishing just financial and trade relations between Western capitalist countries and developing states.

KUZNETSOV ATTENDS PLAN, BUDGET SESSION

LD251102 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0004 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] A joint session of the planning and budget commissions and representatives of other standing commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers was held in the Kremlin on 24 October. The draft state plan for the country's economic and social development for 1984, the results of fulfillment of the present year's plan, and the draft state budget for 1984 were discussed.

Comrade Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, chairman of the chambers' standing commissions, and leaders of ministries and departments took part in the session.

A report by Comrade Maslennikov, chairman of the Planning and Budget Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities, defined the order and deadlines for examining the 1984 plan and budget, the course of plan fulfillment in 1983 and accounted for the budget execution in 1982. Seventeen joint deputy preparatory commissions have been formed to this end.

DEMICHEV ADDRESSES ACADEMY OF ARTS SESSION

LD260038 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] The problems of strengthening the links of masters of arts with the practice of communist construction are at the center of attention for participants at the 39th session of the USSR Academy of Arts. This began today in Moscow. Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of culture, gave a report on the results of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, and the tasks for the further development of socialist art and culture.

The June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum can rightly be called one of the most important stages in events in the life of our party and in the life of the entire Soviet people, he said. The speech by Comrad Andropov and the decisions of the plenum have received unanimous support from the workers of Soviet culture and the entire creative intelligentsia. In the conflict of two polarized, opposing views of the world, two political courses -- socialism and imperialism -- Comrade Demichev stressed, in the struggle for the assertion of principles of reason, a huge role falls to the part of ideological cadres, including workers in culture and art. The Academy of Arts occupies an important place in socialist culture, which this year marked its 225th jubilee. The brightest talents mark out the contemporary multinational membership of the academy, which chooses the highest achievements of socialist and national cultures for itself and concentrates the trends of their interaction and rapproachement on the basis of the method of socialist realism.

The USSR Academy of Arts is now one of the largest scientific-creative establishments, unique in its composition, uniting outstanding figures from the fine arts and architecture, scientific forces, and conducting in its educational establishments the training of new generations of highly qualified artists, Comrade Demichev said. Having sketched the historic achievements of Soviet culture, socialist in its content and internationalist in spirit and character, he noted that nowadays an increasing number of high demands are being made of the ideological functions of art. It is called upon to make a greater contribution to the life of contemporary society, to the formation of socialist civilized life and to the resolution of fundamental questions of the communist education of workers.

The main aim of this work is to enrich art with topical, vital subject matter, to create works of high artistic value which effectively influence the formation of the active, vital position of a Soviet person, and to struggle uncompromisingly with all that contradicts our communist principles. The true path to raising the ideological level of socialist art, to creating works which meet the demands of our time, the tasks of the ideological struggle, is the strengthening of party influence amid the creative intelligentsia, the perfecting of all systems of ideological educative work, and the elaboration of new and more effective forms of this.

In conclusion, Comrade Demichev expressed confidence that in following the Leninist path, tried and tested by history, socialist culture will reach new heights, will further serve as a powerful force in the fight for the cause of the party and the people for the affirmation of the lofty ideals of communism.

Comrade Sysoyev, chief scientific secretary, gave a summary report of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Arts for the past 5 years.

The session is continuing. Also today the authors of the best works of painting, drawing, sculpture, decorative applied arts and works of art criticism were presented with awards of the USSR Academy of Arts. Gold medals were awarded to Alpatrov for works on the history of Russian art published in 1979-1983; Kibalnikov, for the monument to Tretyakov in Moscow; and Shitov, for successful art criticism work in the management of the journal YUNYY KHUDOZHNIK. Silver medals and diplomas of the academy were also presented.

ARMENIAN TU CHAIRMAN TO CHAIR DEPARTMENT

WA241400 [Editorial Report] Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian on 6 Oct 1983 carries on page 1 a 50-word notice of an Armenian Council of Trade Unions plenum which met to deal with organizational questions. The plenum relieved L. G. Saakyan, chairman of the Armenian Council of Trade Unions, of his position in connection with his confirmation as head of the Organizational Party Work Department of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. M.K. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Razdanskiy Raykom, was elected to replace Saakyan.

PRAVDA DISCUSSES WORK WITH LEADER CADRES

PM201549 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Oct 83 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Improving Work With Cadres"]

[Text] Hero of Socialist Labor M. Panfilov was recently awarded the Order of Lenin and a second Hammer and Sickle Gold Medal. This news was received with great satisfaction by the collective of Leningrad's Optical Instruments Association, where Mikhail Panfilovich Panfilov works as general director. He has devoted more than 40 years to the enterprise. This is where he became hero, won the Lenin and State Prizes, and was elected USSR Supreme Soviet deputy. He deserves great credit for the association's formation and development, for the collective's cohesion, and for the development and production of new equipment.

Our country has numerous enterprising and competent workers possessing political maturity and organizational abilities. We are justly proud of them, and the party unswervingly strives to ensure that these qualities are characteristic of everyone appointed to head labor collectives. The further improvement of the qualitative structure and placing of cadres and their education in a spirit of profound awareness of their responsibility to society are one of the most important concerns of party organizations and party committees at all levels.

"Work with cadres," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov said, "must be kept firmly in party hands." As the tasks to be resolved become more complex, the requirements from leaders -- from ministers to team leaders -- increase. Their ability to ensure proper labor discipline and organization and the necessary conditions for people's productive work and good daily life, as well as to establish a healthy moral and psychological climate in the collective, is today valued more highly than ever before. And conversely a worker's inability to organize matters in precisely this way is correctly seen by party organizations as incompatibility with the position he occupies.

The leader educates the collective mainly by his personal example in keeping his word, in his high standard of discipline, impeccable behavior, and his self-critical assessment of his own contribution to the solution of economic and social tasks. Lenin's behest sounds topical even today: "...If we are to conscientiously teach the workers and peasants discipline, we are obliged to start with our own selves."

The communists must bear all this in mind at the report and election meetings and conferences during the exchange of opinions on ways and means of further strengthening party and labor discipline, organization, and order and enhancing the workers' responsibility for respecting all-state interests. When analyzing the practice of selecting, placing, and educating the cadres, it is important to bear in mind that trivia do not and cannot exist in this matter. It is particularly necessary to carefully investigate which forms and methods of cadres work must be developed and enriched even more vigorously and which ones must be "filed in the archives."

Numerous party organizations in Moscow, Leningrad, the Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and other republics have accumulated instructive and interesting experience in enhancing the economic leaders' responsibility for successful work. New and efficient forms of implementing the party's cadres policy are being sought creatively in Georgia, for example. Attempts are being made there to take public opinion more fully into account during the selection and placing of workers. The creation of an atmosphere of strict exactingness toward leaders and specialists is helped by their assessment and reassessment and their reports to the communists and the labor collectives.

"For various reasons," A. Semenov wrote to PRAVDA from Chita Oblast, "collectives are faced with the situation of having to change their leaders. Someone has been 'taken away' for promotion, conversely, someone else has been demoted for being unable to cope with the sector assigned to him, yet another has retired. And the question is: Who is to be leader? A very serious question! And it requires the appropriate approach...." And yet the promotion of people to leadership positions at time occurs without full consideration of their professional, political, or moral qualities and people forget to show interest in the opinion of the primary party organization or the collective. The painstaking efforts needed to compile a reliable cadres reserve are here and there replaced by fussing over the production of "lists" and banal character references. We cannot fail to agree with the authors of letters who note that, if a worker wrecks a job or abuses his official position, we must also discuss the responsibility of those who, at the time, sponsored him for appointment to that position.

The establishment of economic leaders will proceed all the faster the better organized the monitoring of their work not only from above but also from below. It is, however, important that, in both cases, this monitoring should not become petty tutelage over matters directly within the professional field of economic managers and specialists. Special and constant attention must be given to the further improvement of party control over the administration's activity and the activity of the ministry and department apparatus.

During the report and election campaign the communists will be fully justified in declaring: Every worker, regardless of the position he occupies, must be accountable for his actions and conduct mainly to his primary party organization comrades and his labor collective. It is the party organization's duty to support energetically the useful initiatives of leaders and, at the same time, to manifest adherence to principles in the assessment of those among them who show lack of initiative or conduct themselves incorrectly. Much depends on this! Here is just one example. Four years ago the Khalinga Kolkhoz was listed as lagging behind in the Estonian SSR's Pyarnuskiy Rayon. The reasons? Poor leadership, in the first place. No matter how much the local communists tried to influence the chairman, nothing happened. And they openly raised the question of his dismissal. L. Tamvere, who was elected chairman, started with measures to impose discipline and order, which caused dissatisfaction among several kolkhoz members. The party members, however, resolutely supported the new leader and now the kolkhoz is a front-ranking one.

Trust in and exactingness toward workers are seen by the party in indestructible unity. The party committees and primary party organizations, by improving the selection, placing, and education of cadres, are improving the standard of local leadership and helping to implement the decisions of the 26th party congress and the subsequent plenums of its Central Committee.

TASS UPDATES OPERATION TO RESCUE ICE-BOUND SHIPS

LD252348 Moscow TASS in English 1509 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS -- The last ships have been released from the ice trap in the Long Strait, in which a large caravan of freight ships was caught early in October. The nuclear-powered "Leonid Brezhnev" icebreaker (75,000 h.p.) and diesel-electric icebreakers "Yermak" and "Admiral Makarov", which helped "Leonid Brezhnev", overcame the conglomeration of ten-metre-thick ice-hummocks and led to the area of weak ice three motor vessels with cargoes for the Soviet extreme northern regions.

However, it was not the end of the large-scale Arctic operation to rescue freight ships, a TASS correspondent was told by the Deputy Minister of Merchant Marine of the USSR Boris Yunitsin. Thus, the "Igrim" tanker has been kept near the coast of the Chukchi Peninsula for three weeks already, firmly caught by the ice. "Leonid Brezhnev" is on the way to that area to help it out.

All the three Soviet nuclear-powered icebreakers are now taking part in the rescue operation. The veteran ship "Lenin" (44,000 h.p.) took it upon itself to bring to the west several dozens motor vessels and tankers released from the ice trap in the Long Strait. It is operating in the East Siberian Sea. In the Laptev Sea the task was taken over by the nuclear-powered "Sibir" icebreaker (it has a capacity of 75,000 h.p., like "Leonid Brezhnev"). The ship is now cutting a path for another 11 freight ships. It was broadcast from "Sibir" that the situation in that part of the Arctic has suddenly worsened: Strong winds bring ice floes closer together. And still the crew of the icebreaker hope to get to Murmansk in the first half of November. The first group of ships flying the flag of the Far Eastern Steamship Line, which was released from ice in the Long Strait, has already reached this port. In order to get home, to Vladivostok, the ships will have to make a voyage around the world across southern seas.

PRAVDA CARRIES 9-MONTH INDUSTRY FIGURES

PM241133 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 83 First Edition p 1

[USSR Central Statistical Administration report: Speeding Up the March of the 5-Year Plan: Results of the Fulfillment of the State Plan by the USSR's Industry in the First 9 Months of 1983" -- capitalized passages printed in boldface]

[Text] Workers in industry FULFILLED THE PLAN FOR THE FIRST 9 MONTHS FOR OUTPUT SALES by 101 percent. The plan FOR VOLUME OF OUTPUT WAS fulfilled by ALL industrial ministrie and union republics. Targets for the production of many of the most important types of articles were exceeded.

The development of industrial production was accelerated and the main economic indicators improved. The growth in the TOTAL VOLUME OF OUTPUT compared with the same period last year was 4.1 percent. LABOR PRODUCTIVITY increased 3.5 percent; this accounted for 88 percent of the growth in output.

For industry as a whole and the majority of ministries, the growth in labor productivity outstripped the increase in average wages; the correlation between these indicators improved, and corresponded to calculations for the annual plan. Targets for reducing the prime cost and materials-intensiveness of output were fulfilled and profits increased.

The figures on the fulfillment of the plan for output volume and rates of growth of output and labor productivity by MINISTRIES are given below:

All-Union and Union Republican Ministries and Departments	Percentage Fulfillment of 9-Month Plan for Output Volume	First 9 Months of 1983 as Percentage of First 9 Months of 1982	
		Output Volume	Labor Productivity
Power and Electrification	100.7	103	100.5
Petroleum Industry	101	102	99.3
Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry	100.7	102	102
Gas Industry	102	106	104
Coal Industry	100.3	101	99.6
Ferrous Metallurgy	102	104	103
Nonferrous Metallurgy	100.9	103	103
Chemical Industry	102	105	104
Production of Mineral Fertilizers	101	109	107
Power Machine Building	102	106	105
Heavy and Transport Machine Building	101	105	106
Electrical Equipment Industry	102	107	107
Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building	102	108	108
Machine Tool and Tool-Building Industry	102	107	106
Instrument Making, Means of Automation, and Control Systems	102	106	107
Automotive Industry	102	104	104
Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building	102	106	105
Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production	102	110	107
Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building	103	105	105

Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances	100.8	106	106
Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry	101	104	105
Construction Materials Industry	102	104	104
Light Industry	100.5	100.4	102
Food Industry	103	105	105
Fruit and Vegetable Farming	104	110	107
Meat and Dairy Industry	104	108	107
Fish Industry	104	103	104
Procurements	102	103	102
Medical Industry	100.9	108	107
Main Administration of the Microbiological Industry	104	116	112

The indicators for the fulfillment of the plan for output sales and growth rates by UNION REPUBLICS (including industry of union subordination) are characterized by the following:

	Percentage Fulfillment of 9-Month Plan for Output Sales	First 9 Months of 1983 as Percentage of First 9 Months of 1982	
		Output Volume	Labor Productivity
RSFSR	101	103.8	103.6
Ukrainian SSR	102	104.1	103.5
Belorussian SSR	102	104.9	103.8
Uzbek SSR	101	104.5	101.5
Kazakh SSR	102	103.5	101.8
Georgian SSR	102	105.6	104.4
Azerbaijan SSR	102	105.5	103.7
Lithuanian SSR	102	104.8	104.3
Moldavian SSR	103	114.7	113.4
Latvian SSR	101	102.4	102.7
Kirghiz SSR	101	103.7	102.8
Tajik SSR	102	101.5	99.3
Armenian SSR	102	105.3	102.8
Turkmen SSR	104	104.2	102.4
Estonian SSR	102	104.4	104.6

Production of the MOST IMPORTANT TYPES OF OUTPUT in the country as a whole was:

	Production in First 9 Months of 1983	First 9 Months of 1983 as percentage of First 9 Months of 1982
Electricity, billion kilowatt-hours	1,033	104
Oil (including gas condensate), million tons	463	102
Gas, billion cubic meters	393	107
Coal, million tons	538	99.8
Steel, million tons	114	103
Rolled ferrous metal products (finished), million tons	79.3	103

Steel pipes, million tons	14.1	105
Iron ore, million tons	184	100.6
Mineral fertilizers (in terms of 100 percent nutrients), million tons	22.2	109
Chemical plant-protection agents (standard units), thousand tons	420	105
Caustic soda, million tons	2.1	102
Sulfuric acid, million tons	18.2	104
Synthetic resins and plastics, million tons	3.3	108
Chemical fibers and yars, thousand tons	994	107
Motor vehicle tires, millions	46.3	100.6
Turbines, million kilowatts	11.1	86
Turbine generators, million kilowatts	10.0	104
AC electric motors, million kilowatts	40.0	99.8
Metal-cutting machine tools, million rubles	1,648	105
including with digital program control	449	116
Forging and pressing machines, million rubles	495	106
Automatic manipulators with program control (industrial robots), thousands	7.9	206
Instruments, means of automation, and spare parts, billion rubles	3.2	107
Computer equipment and spare parts, billion rubles	2.4	113
Petroleum equipment, million rubles	159	99.6
Chemical equipment and spare parts, million rubles	612	106
Manufacturing equipment and spare parts for light and food industry, billion rubles	1.2	106
Mainline diesel locomotives, million horsepower	3.0	108
Mainline electric locomotives, million horsepower	2.9	101
Mainline freightcars, thousands	44.0	100.2
Tractors, million horsepower	36.8	103
Agricultural machines, billion rubles	2.6	105
Machines for animal husbandry and feed production, billion rubles	1.8	106
Combines, thousands:		
grain harvesting	87.9	106
corn harvesting	1.5	130
potato harvesting	7.0	86
Beet-harvesting machines, thousands	7.0	95
Cotton-harvesting machines, thousands	7.6	102
Excavators, thousands	31.5	98
Commercial timber (excluding kolkhoz timber procurements), million cubic meters	210	100.3
Paper, million tons	4.2	104
of which newsprint, billion square meters	23.4	102
Cement, million tons	95.7	104
Precast ferroconcrete, million cubic meters	94	103
Textiles, all types, billion square meters	8.4	102
Sewn goods, billion rubles	17.4	100.1
Knitted underwear and outerwear, billion items	1.2	102

Leather footwear, million pairs	550	102
Meat (industrial output), million tons	7.3	109
Sausage products, million tons	2.3	103
Edible fish products, including canned fish, billion rubles	5.1	105
Butter, million tons	1.2	114
Wholemilk products in milk equivalent, million tons	21.1	106
Margarine, million tons	1.1	103
Vegetable oil, million tons	1.8	109
Confectionery, million tons	3.0	102
Canned goods, billion standard cans	13.2	106
including fruit and vegetables	9.3	107
Clocks and watches, millions	52.3	99.2
Chinaware and earthenware, million rubles	652	104
High-grade utensils (glass and crystal), billion rubles	1.0	103
Radio receivers, millions	6.9	105
Television sets, millions	6.4	103
including color sets	2.5	111
Refrigerators and freezers, millions	4.3	98
including those with capacity of 200 cubic decimeters or more	2.1	105
Washing machines, millions	3.2	107
Cars, thousands	986	101
Motorcycles and motor scooters, thousands	840	102
Furniture, billion rubles	5.3	106

The plan was fulfilled for oil and gas extraction and the production of steel pipes, motor vehicle tires, instruments, means of automation, and computer equipment, manufacturing equipment for light and food industry, diesel locomotives, electric locomotives, paper, mineral fertilizers, chemical plant-protection agents, tractors, agricultural machines, machines for animal husbandry and feed production, and other machinery for agriculture.

The number of varieties of the most important types of output where output lags behind the targets set was reduced compared with the same period last year.

The output of economical types of metal products, industrial robots, machines and equipment with higher technical and economic parameters, and metal-cutting machine tools with digital program control and of the "processing center" type increased.

The planned volume of output was achieved for most consumer goods: linen textiles, edible fish products, butter and vegetable oil, wholemilk products, confectionery, chinaware, earthenware, and high-grade utensils, radio receivers, television sets, cars, furniture, and a number of other products.

At the same time the industrial ministries -- and in particular the Ministries of Ferrous Metallurgy, the Coal, Chemical, and Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry, Power and Heavy and Transport Machine-Building, Light Industry, and Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood-Processing Industry -- did not take due measures to ensure the fulfillment by subordinate assoications and enterprises of commitments for deliveries of output to consumers in accordance with contracts concluded and orders adopted for fulfillment.

The plan was not fulfilled for the production of synthetic resins and plastics, chemical fibers and yarns, AC electric motors, chemical equipment, commercial timber, precast ferroconcrete, knitted underwear and outerwear, leather footwear, washing machines, and certain other articles.

Individual production associations and enterprises failed to fulfill plans for labor productivity, prime cost, and accumulations and produced output not in demand among the population.

Measures were implemented to improve the technical level of production. Some 6,000 mechanized flow and automated production lines were installed at industrial enterprises, 3,500 sectors, shops, and production facilities were transferred to comprehensive mechanization and automation, and 153 systems of automated control of manufacturing processes were created. The output of more than 2,000 new articles was assimilated and started up and some 2,500 obsolete types of industrial output were withdrawn from production. But a number of targets for the assimilation and introduction of new machinery were not fulfilled by industry.

Labor collectives are working to further increase production efficiency, strengthen labor discipline, and ensure the fulfillment of the plans set and the socialist pledges adopted.

CSA DATA ON PROGRESS OF RSFSR AUTUMN FIELD WORK

LD260656 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] The RSFSR CSA today published data on the progress of autumn field operations. Over the past week winter crop sowing has continued in the south. By the middle of the third 10 days of October winter crops covered more than 21 million hectares, which is more than last year at the same time. Winter-fallow plowing is currently the most extensive operation. Oblasts such as Tula, Gorkiy, and Mordovia have fulfilled the plan. Harvesting of sugar beets, sunflower, potatoes, and vegetables is continuing in the south. One of the latest farm crops, soya, still remains to be harvested on a considerable area; it is being threshed by collective and state farms in the south of the European part of the RSFSR and the Far East.

USSR LIVESTOCK-RAISING FIGURES FOR JAN-SEP 1983

PM251213 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 43, Oct 83 (Signed to Press 17 Oct 83) p 18

[Unattributed "Statistical Summary": "Livestock Raising on Kolkhozes and Sovkhozes"]

[Text] The editorial board has received USSR Central Statistical Administration data on the state of livestock raising on the country's kolkhozes and sovkhozes in January-September 1983.

Thanks to their strengthening the feed base and improving the animals' upkeep, many kolkhozes and sovkhozes are successfully fulfilling the plan targets, increasing production in livestock units, improving output quality, and reducing prime costs. The experience of progressive farms in every region shows that kolkhozes and sovkhozes possess considerable reserves for the accelerated development of livestock raising. Disseminating it everywhere will make it possible to considerably improve the efficiency of this important production sector.

I. Production of Livestock Products

Indicators	Jan-Sep 1983	Jan-Sep 1983 as Percentage of Jan-Sep 1982
Meat production (sales of livestock and poultry for slaughter, live weight) -- thousand metric tons	12,291	106
of which:		
cattle	6,916	104
hogs	3,029	110
sheep and goats	792	103
poultry	1,554	109
Gross milk yield -- thousand metric tons	55,079	108
Average milk yield per cow -- kg	1,943	108
Hens' eggs -- millions	38,660	105
Average laying capacity of laying hens -- units	160	103

In January-September 1983 meat production on kolkhozes and sovkhozes increased by 692,000 metric tons compared with the same period last year. Production of this product increased on farms in the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Uzbekistan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Lithuania, Moldavia, Latvia, Turkmenistan, and Estonia. In the RSFSR the greatest growth in meat production was secured on farms in Arkhangelsk, Vologda, Murmansk, Novgorod, Pskov, Vladimir, Kaluga, Orel, Ryazan, Tula, Kirov, Tambov, Penza, Ulyanovsk, and Rostov Oblasts.

The gross milk yield over the 9 months was 3,925,000 metric tons more than for the same period last year. Farms in the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Lithuania, Moldavia, Latvia, and Estonia achieved the greatest growth in milk production.

Egg production on kolkhozes and sovkhozes increased by 1,928 million eggs over the 9 months. An increase in this output was achieved by farms in all the union republics.

II. Purchases of Livestock Products on Kolkhozes, Sovkhozes, and Other State Farms

Types of Produce Purchased	Purchased in Jan-Sep 1983	Jan-Sep 1983 as percentage of Jan-Sep 1982
Livestock and poultry (live weight) -- thousand metric tons	12,208	107
Milk -- thousand metric tons	51,310	111
Eggs -- millions	36,124	104

The volume of sales of livestock and poultry to the state by kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other state farms during January-September 1983 increased by 777,000 metric tons compared with the same period of 1982. Purchases of these products increased in all the union republics except Armenia, Kirghizia, and Kazakhstan. Farms in Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Moldavia secured the greatest growth in sales of livestock and poultry. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes sold cattle at an average weight of 354 kg. The average weight of hogs was 105 kg.

Purchases of milk and dairy products increased by 4,904,000 metric tons. There was growth in purchases of these products in all the union republics except Georgia and Armenia. Farms in Latvia, Moldavia, Lithuania, Estonia, the Ukraine, and the RSFSR secured the greatest increase in milk purchases. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the Chuvash and Mari ASSR's, Kirov Oblast, Maritime Kray, Gorkiy and Kaliningrad Oblasts, and the Mordovian and Tatar ASSR's considerably increased sales of these products.

Egg sales to the state during January-September increased by 1,394 million eggs. Purchases of this product increased on farms in all the union republics.

III. Production and Purchases of Livestock Products in the Union Republics

	January-September 1983 as percentage of January-September 1982					
	produced			Purchased		
	meat	milk	eggs	livestock and poultry	milk	eggs
USSR	106	108	105	107	111	104
RSFSR	106	108	105	107	110	103

of which:						
Nonchernozem Zone	110	112	105	111	115	103
Ukrainian SSR	104	109	106	105	112	106
Belorussian SSR	108	104	105	108	107	103
Uzbek SSR	104	102	100	107	106	100.9
Kazakh SSR	99.7	100.7	105	99.98	104	104
Georgian SSR	105	110.9	113	109	98	109
Azerbaijan SSR	102	103	107	102	103	108
Lithuanian SSR	121	107	106	122	116	106
Moldavian SSR	112	115	107	114	120	106
Latvian SSR	112	110	111	116	121	111
Kirghiz SSR	95	99.7	110	95	102	108
Tajik SSR	99.4	102	108	100.3	104	105
Armenian SSR	89	100.1	115	89	99.92	114
Turkmen SSR	101	100.5	106	103	106	107
Estonian SSR	128	111	103	129	116	103

In addition, procurement organizations purchased 695,000 metric tons of milk and 359,000 metric tons of livestock from the population's private plots in January-September 1983.

IV. Livestock Numbers

As of 1 October 1983 there were 93.7 million head of cattle on kolkhozes and sovkhozes -- 1.8 million more than at the same date last year. There were 29.8 million cows. There were 61.5 million hogs on farms -- which is 2.4 million more. There were 125 million sheep and goats. Their numbers have increased by 2.4 million. The poultry population totaled 743.4 million birds, an increase of 17.5 million. The cattle population increased on kolkhozes and sovkhozes in all the union republics except Georgia, Latvia, and Estonia. The hog population increased on kolkhozes and sovkhozes in all the union republics except for farms in Kazakhstan. The number of sheep and goats increased on farms in the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Lithuania, Moldavia, Latvia, and Turkmenistan.

Livestock raisers on the majority of farms are making preparations for livestock wintering in an organized manner. Use is being made of every opportunity to replenish feed stock by using late crops. The premises and equipment of livestock units are being repaired. Special attention is being devoted to creating good domestic conditions for livestock raisers and providing them with everything they need for fruitful work.

MOSCOW AREA POTATO, VEGETABLE SALES EXCEED PLAN

PM251057 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 83 First Edition p 1

[USSR Central Statistical Administration report: "The Storage Facilities Are Filling Up"]

[Text] In implementing the decisions of the 26th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee plenums on further developing agriculture, the agricultural workers of Moscow Oblast have fulfilled their socialist pledges for potato sales to the state. Some 775,000 metric tons of potatoes, which is 48,000 tons above the state plan, have been received at procurement centers and processing enterprises.

The farms have fully provided themselves with the seed for next year's harvest.

The oblast's vegetable growers have dispatched more than 700,000 metric tons of produce to the state, which is in excess of the established plan.

Potato and vegetable sales to the state are continuing.

OBITUARY OF MILITARY CONSULTANT BEDNYAGIN

PM192049 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Oct 83 First Edition p 4

[Excerpts] Colonel General Anatoliy Ivanovich Bednyagin, eminent political worker of the USSR Armed Forces and participant in the Great Patriotic War, died suddenly on 16 October 1983 in his 70th year. He devoted his entire conscious life to serving the motherland and the cause of the Communist Party, which he joined in 1931.

A.I. Bednyagin was born into a peasant family in the village of Andreyevskoye, Vologda Oblast, in 1914.

In 1947 he graduated from the V.I. Lenin Military-Political Academy and in 1956 from the K.Ye. Voroshilov Military Academy of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff. He served in various party political posts among the troops and in the apparatus of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. He was a member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Directorate of Odessa Military District and later of Kiev Military District. From 1975 he was a consultant at the Marshal of the Soviet Union A.M. Vasilevskiy Military Academy of Air Defense.

V.V. Shcherbitskiy, N.V. Ogarkov, V.G. Kulikov, S.L. Sokolov, A.A. Yepishev, V.I. Petrov, I.N. Shkadov, A.I. Sorokin, M.G. Sobolev, B.P. Utkin, M.D. Popkov, I.A. Gerasimov, V.S. Rodin, A.K. Fedorov, A.D. Fomin, G.I. Kuropatkin, V.Ye. Pankin, V.A. Prudnikov, L.M. Goncharov, N.P. Zabudskiy, V.A. Rabchevskiy

KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL EDITOR'S OBITUARY

PM241055 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Oct 83 First Edition p 4

[Excerpts] Major General Viktor Mikhaylovich Makarov, chief editor of KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL, journal of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, participant in the Great Patriotic War, and CPSU member since 1942, has died after a serious illness.

V.M. Makarov was born in the city of Sapozhok, Ryazan Oblast, in March 1918.

From 1975 through the last days of his life Maj Gen V.M. Makarov was chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL.

A.A. Yepishev, A.I. Sorokin, M.G. Sobolev, B.N. Utkin, P.A. Gorchakov, M.D. Popkov, S.A. Bobylev, L.L. Batekhin, P.N. Medvedev, V.M. Dutov, V.D. Lukinykh, A.N. Agafonov, V.I. Balakirev, D.A. Volkogonov, N.I. Makeyev, V.S. Ryabov, N.I. Smorigo, V.I. Korolenko, A.I. Skrylnik, N.A. Kosholev, I.A. Zubkov, V.A. Voronov, I.I. Sidelnikov, B.V. Pendyur, A.M. Plekhov